University of Greifswald (October, 1997)

DSF 97/45

Gauge theories on manifolds with boundary

Ivan G. Avramidi [1] [2]

Department of Mathematics, University of Greifswald
F.-L.-Jahnstr. 15a, D–17489 Greifswald, Germany
and
Department of Mathematics, The University of Iowa
14 MacLean Hall, Iowa City, IA 52242-1419, USA

Giampiero Esposito

Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, Sezione di Napoli
Complesso Universitario di M. S. Angelo, Edificio G, 80126 Napoli, Italy
and
Università di Napoli Federico II, Dipartimento di Scienze Fisiche
Mostra d'Oltremare Padiglione 19, 80125 Napoli, Italy

arXiv:hep-th/9710048v2 10 Apr 1998

Revised on April 1998

The boundary-value problem for Laplace-type operators acting on smooth sections of a vector bundle over a compact Riemannian manifold with generalized local boundary conditions including both normal and tangential derivatives is studied. The condition of strong ellipticity of this boundary-value problem is formulated. The resolvent kernel and the heat kernel in the leading approximation are explicitly constructed. As a result, the previous work in the literature on heat-kernel asymptotics is shown to be a particular case of a more general structure. For a bosonic gauge theory on a compact Riemannian manifold with smooth boundary, the problem is studied of obtaining a gauge-field operator of Laplace type, jointly with local and gauge-invariant boundary conditions, which should lead to a strongly elliptic boundary-value problem. The scheme is extended to fermionic gauge theories by means of local and gauge-invariant projectors. After deriving a general condition for the validity of strong ellipticity for gauge theories, it is proved that for Euclidean Yang–Mills theory and Rarita–Schwinger fields all the above conditions can be satisfied. For Euclidean quantum gravity, however, this property no longer holds, i.e. the corresponding boundary-value problem is not strongly elliptic. Some non-standard local formulae for the leading asymptotics of the heat-kernel diagonal are also obtained. It is shown that, due to the absence of strong ellipticity, the heat-kernel diagonal is non-integrable near the boundary.

---

[1] On leave of absence from Research Institute for Physics, Rostov State University, Stachki 194, 344104 Rostov-on-Don, Russia.

[2] E-mail: iavramid@math.uiowa.edu

1 Introduction

The consideration of boundary conditions in the formulation of quantum field theories is crucial for at least two reasons:

(i) Boundary effects are necessary to obtain a complete prescription for the quantization, unless one studies the idealized case where no bounding surfaces occur. In particular, the functional-integral approach relies heavily on a careful assignment of boundary data.

(ii) One may wonder whether the symmetries of the theory in the absence of boundaries are preserved by their inclusion. Moreover, one would like to know whether the application of a commonly accepted physical principle (e.g. the invariance under infinitesimal diffeomorphisms on metric perturbations, in the case of gravitation) is sufficient to determine completely the desired form of the boundary conditions, upon combination with other well known mathematical properties.

The investigations carried out in our paper represent the attempt to solve these problems by using the advanced tools of analysis and geometry, with application to the operators of Laplace or Dirac type. Indeed, the differential operators of Laplace type are well known to play a crucial role in mathematical physics. By choosing a suitable gauge it is almost always possible to reduce the problem of evaluating the Green functions and the effective action in quantum field theory to a calculation of Green functions (and hence the resolvent) and functional determinants (or the ζ-functions) of Laplace-type operators. These objects are well defined, strictly speaking, only for self-adjoint elliptic operators. Thus, on manifolds with boundary, one has to impose some boundary conditions which guarantee the self-adjointness and the ellipticity of the Laplace-type operator. The simplest choice are the Dirichlet and Neumann boundary conditions when the fields or their normal derivatives are set to zero on the boundary. A slight modification of the Neumann boundary conditions are the so-called Robin ones, when one sets to zero at the boundary a linear combination of the values of the fields and their normal derivatives. An even more general scheme corresponds to a mixed situation when some field components satisfy Dirichlet conditions, and the remaining ones are subject to Robin boundary conditions [1, 2].

However, this is not the most general scheme, and one can define some *generalized* boundary conditions which are still local but include both normal and tangential derivatives of the fields [3]. For example, by using linear covariant gauges in quantum gravity, one is led to impose boundary conditions that involve the tangential derivatives as well, to ensure that the whole set of boundary conditions on metric perturbations is invariant under infinitesimal diffeomorphisms [4, 5]. The same boundary conditions may be derived by constructing a BRST charge and requiring BRST invariance of the boundary conditions [6].

In this paper we are going to study the generalized boundary-value problem for Laplace- and Dirac-type operators, the latter being relevant for the analysis of fermionic models. Such a boundary-value problem, however, is not automatically elliptic. Therefore, we find first an explicit criterion of ellipticity (section 2.3). Then we construct the resolvent kernel and the heat kernel in the leading approximation (section 3). The application of this formalism (section 4) proves that the generalized boundary-value problem is strongly elliptic for Euclidean Yang–Mills theory (section 5) and Rarita–Schwinger fields (section 6), but not for Euclidean quantum gravity (section 7). The possible implications are discussed in section 8.

2 Laplace-type and Dirac-type operators

Let (M, g) be a smooth compact Riemannian manifold of dimension m with smooth boundary, say ∂M. Let g be the positive-definite Riemannian metric on M and $\hat{g}$ be the induced metric on ∂M. Let V be a (smooth) vector bundle over the manifold M and $C^\infty(V, M)$ be the space of smooth sections of the bundle V. Let V^* be the dual vector bundle and $E: V \to V^*$ be a Hermitian non-degenerate metric, $E^\dagger = E$, that determines the Hermitian fibre scalar product in V. Using the invariant Riemannian volume element $d\mathrm{vol}\,(x)$ on M one defines a natural L^2 inner product $(,)$ in $C^\infty(V, M)$, and the Hilbert space $L^2(V, M)$ as the completion of $C^\infty(V, M)$ in this norm. Further, let ∇^V be the connection on the vector bundle V compatible with the metric E, $\mathrm{tr}_g = g \otimes 1$ be the contraction of sections of the bundle $T^*M \otimes T^*M \otimes V$ with the metric on the cotangent bundle T^*M, and Q be a smooth endomorphism of the bundle V, i.e. $Q \in \mathrm{End}\,(V)$, satisfying the condition

$$\bar{Q} \equiv E^{-1} Q^\dagger E = Q. \tag{2.1}$$

Hereafter we call such endomorphisms self-adjoint. We also use the notation $\bar{A} = E^{-1} A^\dagger E$ for any endomorphisms or operators. Then a Laplace-type operator, or generalized Laplacian,

$$F: C^\infty(V, M) \to C^\infty(V, M), \tag{2.2}$$

is a second-order differential operator defined by

$$F \equiv -\mathrm{tr}_g \nabla^{T^*M \otimes V} \nabla^V + Q, \tag{2.3}$$

where

$$\nabla^{T^*M \otimes V} = \nabla^{T^*M} \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes \nabla^V, \tag{2.4}$$

and ∇^{T^*M} is the Levi-Civita connection on M.

Let V be a Clifford bundle and $\Gamma: T^*M \to \mathrm{End}\,(V)$, $\Gamma(\xi) = \Gamma^\mu \xi_\mu$, be the Clifford map satisfying

$$\Gamma(\xi_1)\Gamma(\xi_2) + \Gamma(\xi_2)\Gamma(\xi_1) = 2g(\xi_1, \xi_2)I, \tag{2.5}$$

for all $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in T^*M$. Hereafter I denotes the identity endomorphism of the bundle V. Let ∇^V be the Clifford connection compatible with the Clifford map. Then a Dirac-type operator

$$D: C^\infty(V, M) \to C^\infty(V, M), \tag{2.6}$$

is a first-order differential operator defined by [1, 7]

$$D \equiv i(\Gamma \nabla^V + S), \tag{2.7}$$

with $S \in \mathrm{End}\,(V)$. Of course, the square of the Dirac operator is a Laplace-type operator.

2.1 Geometry of boundary operators

2.1.1 Laplace-type operator

For a Laplace-type operator we define the *boundary data* by

$$\psi_F(\varphi) = \begin{pmatrix} \psi_0(\varphi) \\ \psi_1(\varphi) \end{pmatrix}, \tag{2.8}$$

where

$$\psi_0(\varphi) \equiv \varphi|_{\partial M}, \qquad \psi_1(\varphi) \equiv \nabla_N \varphi|_{\partial M} \tag{2.9}$$

are the restrictions of the sections $\varphi \in C^\infty(V, M)$ and their normal derivatives, to the boundary (hereafter, N is the inward-pointing unit normal vector field to the boundary). To make the operator F symmetric and elliptic (see sections 2.2 and 2.3), one has to impose some conditions on the boundary data $\psi_F(\varphi)$.

In general, a d-graded vector bundle is a vector bundle jointly with a fixed decomposition into d sub-bundles [1]. In our problem, let the vector bundle W_F over ∂M be the bundle of the boundary data. W_F consists of two copies of the restriction of V to ∂M and inherits a natural grading [1]

$$W_F = W_0 \oplus W_1, \tag{2.10}$$

where W_j represents normal derivatives of order j, and, therefore,

$$\dim W_F = 2 \dim V. \tag{2.11}$$

The bundles W_0 and W_1 have the same structure, and hence in the following they will be often identified. Let $W'_F = W'_0 \oplus W'_1$ be an auxiliary graded vector bundle over ∂M such that

$$\dim W'_F = \dim V. \tag{2.12}$$

Since the dimension of the bundle W_F is twice as big as the dimension of W'_F, $\dim W_F = 2 \dim W'_F$, it is convenient to identify the bundle W'_F with a sub-bundle of W_F by means of a projection

$$P_F : \; W_F \to W'_F, \qquad P_F^2 = P_F. \tag{2.13}$$

In other words, sections of the bundle W'_F have the form $P_F \chi$, with χ being a section of the bundle W_F. Note that the rank of the projector P_F is equal to the dimension of the bundle V,

$$\operatorname{rank} P_F = \operatorname{rank} (I_W - P_F) = \dim V, \tag{2.14}$$

where I_W is the identity endomorphism of the bundle W_F.

Let $B_F : C^\infty(W_F, \partial M) \to C^\infty(W'_F, \partial M)$ be a tangential differential operator on ∂M. The boundary conditions then read

$$B_F \psi_F(\varphi) = 0. \tag{2.15}$$

The boundary operator B_F is not arbitrary but should satisfy some conditions to make the operator F self-adjoint and elliptic. These conditions are formulated in the subsects. 2.2 and 2.3. The boundary operator B_F can be then presented in the form

$$B_F = P_F L, \tag{2.16}$$

where L is a *non-singular* tangential operator

$$L : C^\infty(W_F, \partial M) \to C^\infty(W_F, \partial M), \tag{2.17}$$

meaning that there is a well defined inverse operator L^{-1}. In other words, the boundary conditions mean

$$\psi_F(\varphi) = K_F \chi \qquad \text{with arbitrary } \chi \in C^\infty(W_F, \partial M), \tag{2.18}$$

where

$$K_F = L^{-1}(I_W - P_F) :\ C^\infty(W_F, \partial M) \to C^\infty(W_F, \partial M). \tag{2.19}$$

Now let Π be a self-adjoint projector acting on W_0 and W_1,

$$\Pi :\ W_0 \to W_0, \qquad \Pi :\ W_1 \to W_1 \tag{2.20}$$

$$\Pi^2 = \Pi, \qquad \bar{\Pi} \equiv E^{-1}\Pi^\dagger E = \Pi. \tag{2.21}$$

In our analysis, we will consider the projector P_F and the operator L of the form

$$P_F = \Pi \oplus (I - \Pi) = \begin{pmatrix} \Pi & 0 \\ 0 & (I - \Pi) \end{pmatrix}, \tag{2.22}$$

$$L = \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ \Lambda & I \end{pmatrix}, \tag{2.23}$$

where Λ is a tangential differential operator on ∂M, $\Lambda :\ C^\infty(W_0, \partial M) \to C^\infty(W_0, \partial M)$, satisfying the conditions

$$\Pi\Lambda = \Lambda\Pi = 0. \tag{2.24}$$

Of course, $\operatorname{rank} P_F = \operatorname{rank}\Pi + \operatorname{rank}(I - \Pi) = \dim V$ as needed. Hence we obtain

$$B_F = \begin{pmatrix} \Pi & 0 \\ \Lambda & I_W - \Pi \end{pmatrix}, \qquad K_F = I_W - B_F = \begin{pmatrix} I_W - \Pi & 0 \\ -\Lambda & \Pi \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2.25}$$

Note that B_F and K_F are complementary projectors

$$B_F^2 = B_F, \qquad K_F^2 = K_F, \qquad B_F K_F = K_F B_F = 0. \tag{2.26}$$

Moreover, by virtue of the property (2.14), both the operators B_F and K_F do not vanish.

2.1.2 Dirac-type operator

For a Dirac-type operator (see (2.7)) the normal derivatives are *not* included in the boundary data $\psi_D(\varphi)$, and such boundary data consist only of the restriction $\psi_D(\varphi) = \psi_0(\varphi)$ (see (2.9)) of sections $\varphi \in C^\infty(V, M)$ to the boundary. Therefore, the bundle of the boundary data W_D is just the restriction W_0 of the bundle V and, similarly, the auxiliary vector bundle $W'_D = W'_0$. The dimensions of these bundles are

$$\dim W_D = 2 \dim W'_D = \dim V. \tag{2.27}$$

This should be compared with (2.11) and (2.12). As above, W'_D can be identified with a sub-bundle of W_D by means of a projection

$$P_D : \ W_D \to W'_D, \tag{2.28}$$

but now the dimension of the projector P_D is equal to *half* the dimension of the bundle V:

$$\operatorname{rank} P_D = \frac{1}{2} \dim V. \tag{2.29}$$

The boundary conditions for the operator D read

$$B_D \psi_0(\varphi) = 0, \tag{2.30}$$

where now the operator B_D is not a tangential differential operator but just a projector P_D:

$$B_D = P_D, \qquad K_D = I - P_D. \tag{2.31}$$

It is crucial to use projectors to obtain a well posed boundary-value problem of local nature for Dirac-type operators, since any attempt to fix the whole fermionic field at the boundary would lead to an over-determined problem.

2.2 Symmetry

2.2.1 Laplace-type operator

The Laplace-type operator F is *formally self-adjoint*, which means that it is symmetric on any section of the bundle V with compact support *disjoint* from the boundary ∂M, i.e.

$$I_F(\varphi_1, \varphi_2) \equiv (F\varphi_1, \varphi_2) - (\varphi_1, F\varphi_2) = 0, \qquad \text{for } \varphi_1, \varphi_2 \in C_0^\infty(V, M). \tag{2.32}$$

However, a formally self-adjoint operator is not necessarily self-adjoint. It is *essentially self-adjoint* if its closure is self-adjoint. This implies that the operator F is such that: i) it is symmetric on any smooth section satisfying the boundary conditions (2.15), i.e.

$$I_F(\varphi_1, \varphi_2) = 0, \qquad \text{for } \ \varphi_1, \varphi_2 \in C^\infty(V, M) : \qquad B_F \psi(\varphi_1) = B_F \psi(\varphi_2) = 0, \tag{2.33}$$

and ii) there exists a unique self-adjoint extension of F. The property ii) can be proved by studying deficiency indices [8], but is not the object of our investigation.

The antisymmetric bilinear form $I_F(\varphi_1,\varphi_2)$ depends on the boundary data. Integrating by parts, it is not difficult to obtain

$$I_F(\varphi_1,\varphi_2) =< \psi(\varphi_1), J_F\psi(\varphi_2) >, \tag{2.34}$$

where

$$J_F = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & I \\ -I & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2.35}$$

Here $<,>$ denotes the L^2 inner product in $C^\infty(W,\partial M)$ determined by the restriction of the fibre metric to the boundary.

To ensure the symmetry, we have to fix the boundary operators B_F so as to make this form *identically* zero. The condition for that reads

$$\bar{K}_F J_F K_F = 0. \tag{2.36}$$

By using the general form (2.25) of the operator K_F, we find herefrom that this is equivalent to the condition of symmetry of the operator Λ

$$< \Lambda\varphi_1, \varphi_2 >=< \varphi_1, \Lambda\varphi_2 >, \qquad \text{for } \varphi_1,\varphi_2 \in C^\infty(W_0,\partial M), \tag{2.37}$$

Thus, we have proven the following result:

Theorem 1 *The Laplace-type operator F (2.3) endowed with the the boundary conditions (2.15), with the boundary operator B given by (2.25), and any symmetric operator* Λ *satisfying the conditions (2.24) and (2.37), is symmetric.*

2.2.2 Dirac-type operator

In the case of Dirac-type operators there are two essentially different cases. The point is that, in general, there exist two *different* representations of the Clifford algebra satisfying

$$\bar{\Gamma}(\xi) = -\varepsilon\Gamma(\xi), \qquad \varepsilon = \pm 1. \tag{2.38}$$

In odd dimension m there is only one possibility, $\varepsilon = -1$, corresponding to self-adjoint Dirac matrices, whereas for even dimension m they can be either self-adjoint or anti-self-adjoint. By requiring the endomorphism S to satisfy the condition

$$\bar{S} = \varepsilon S, \tag{2.39}$$

we see that the Dirac-type operator (2.7) is formally self-adjoint for $\varepsilon = -1$ and anti-self-adjoint for $\varepsilon = 1$:

$$I_D(\varphi_1,\varphi_2) \equiv (D\varphi_1,\varphi_2) + \varepsilon(\varphi_1, D\varphi_2) = 0, \qquad \varphi_1,\varphi_2 \in C_0^\infty(V,M). \tag{2.40}$$

In complete analogy with the above, we easily find the condition for the Dirac-type operator to be (anti)-symmetric,

$$I_D(\varphi_1,\varphi_2) =< \psi_0(\varphi_1), J_D\psi_0(\varphi_2) >= 0, \tag{2.41}$$

where

$$J_D = i\varepsilon\Gamma(N) = i\varepsilon\Gamma^\mu N_\mu, \tag{2.42}$$

for any $\varphi_1, \varphi_2 \in C^\infty(V, M)$ satisfying the boundary conditions (2.30). This leads to a condition on the boundary operator,

$$\bar{K}_D J_D K_D = 0, \tag{2.43}$$

wherefrom, by using (2.31), we obtain a condition for the projector P_D,

$$(I - \bar{P}_D)\Gamma(N)(I - P_D) = 0. \tag{2.44}$$

Hence we get a sufficient condition on the boundary projector,

$$\bar{P}_D = \Gamma(N)(I - P_D)\Gamma(N)^{-1}. \tag{2.45}$$

This means that P_D can be expressed in the form

$$P_D = \frac{1}{2}(I + \eta), \tag{2.46}$$

where η satisfies the conditions

$$\eta^2 = I, \qquad \bar{\eta}\Gamma(N) + \Gamma(N)\eta = 0. \tag{2.47}$$

Thus, there are two cases: i) η is anti-self-adjoint and commutes with $\Gamma(N)$, ii) η is self-adjoint and anti-commutes with $\Gamma(N)$. This leads to two particular solutions,

$$\eta = \pm\Gamma(N), \qquad \text{for } \varepsilon = 1, \qquad \text{and even } \ m, \tag{2.48}$$

and

$$\eta = \frac{1}{|u|}\Gamma(u), \qquad \text{for } \varepsilon = -1 \qquad \text{and any } \ m, \tag{2.49}$$

with some cotangent vector $u \in T^*\partial M$ on the boundary.

In *even* dimension m there exists another very simple solution,

$$\eta = \pm C, \qquad \text{for even } m, \qquad \varepsilon = \pm 1, \tag{2.50}$$

where C is the *chirality* operator defined with the help of an orthonormal basis e^a in T^*M,

$$C = i^{m/2}\Gamma(e^1)\cdots\Gamma(e^m). \tag{2.51}$$

One easily finds

$$C^2 = I, \qquad \bar{C} = C, \tag{2.52}$$

$$C\Gamma(\xi) + \Gamma(\xi)C = 0, \tag{2.53}$$

for any $\xi \in T^*M$, so that the conditions (2.47) are satisfied.

Thus, we have

Theorem 2 *The Dirac-type operator* $D = i(\Gamma\nabla + S)$ *with* Γ *and* S *satisfying the conditions* $\bar\Gamma = -\varepsilon\Gamma$, $\bar S = \varepsilon S$, *endowed with the boundary conditions* $P_D\varphi|_{\partial M} = 0$, *is anti-symmetric for* $\varepsilon = -1$ *and symmetric for* $\varepsilon = 1$ *provided that the boundary projector* P_D *satisfies the condition* $(I - \bar P_D)\Gamma(N)(I - P_D) = 0$. *Admissible boundary projectors satisfying this criterion are: for* $\varepsilon = 1$

$$P_D = \frac{1}{2}\left[I \pm \Gamma(N)\right], \tag{2.54}$$

and, for $\varepsilon = -1$,

$$P_D(u) = \frac{1}{2}\left[I + \frac{1}{|u|}\Gamma(u)\right], \tag{2.55}$$

where $u \in T^*\partial M$. *In the case of an even-dimensional manifold* M, *the boundary projector*

$$P_D = \frac{1}{2}\left(I \pm C\right), \tag{2.56}$$

C *being the chirality operator, is also admissible.*

2.3 Strong ellipticity

2.3.1 Laplace-type operator

Now we are going to study the ellipticity of the boundary-value problem defined by the boundary operator (2.25). First of all we fix the notation. By using the inward geodesic flow, we identify a narrow neighbourhood of the boundary ∂M with a part of $\partial M \times \mathbf{R}_+$ and define a split of the cotangent bundle $T^*M = T^*\partial M \oplus T^*(\mathbf{R})$. Let $\hat x = (\hat x^i)$, $(i = 1, 2, \dots, m-1)$, be the local coordinates on ∂M and r be the normal geodesic distance to the boundary, so that $N = \partial_r = \partial/\partial r$ is the inward unit normal on ∂M. Near ∂M we choose the local coordinates $x = (x^\mu) = (\hat x, r)$, $(\mu = 1, 2, \dots, m)$ and the split $\xi = (\xi_\mu) = (\zeta, \omega) \in T^*M$, where $\zeta = (\zeta_j) \in T^*\partial M$ and $\omega \in \mathbf{R}$. With our notation, Greek indices run from 1 through m and lower case Latin indices run from 1 through $m - 1$.

Our presentation differs from the one in [9], since we always work with self-adjoint projectors. In this paper we are interested in the so-called generalized boundary conditions, when Λ is a *first-order* tangential differential operator acting on sections of the vector bundle W_0 over ∂M. Any formally self-adjoint operator of first order satisfying the conditions (2.24) can be put in the form (hereafter, $\hat\nabla_i$ denotes $(m-1)$-dimensional covariant differentiation tangentially, defined in ref. [1])

$$\Lambda = (I - \Pi)\left\{\frac{1}{2}(\Gamma^i\hat\nabla_i + \hat\nabla_i\Gamma^i) + S\right\}(I - \Pi), \tag{2.57}$$

where $\Gamma^i \in C^\infty(T\partial M \otimes \mathrm{End}\,(W_0), \partial M)$ are some endomorphism-valued vector fields on ∂M, and S is some endomorphism of the vector bundle W_0, satisfying the conditions

$$\bar\Gamma^i = -\Gamma^i, \qquad \bar S = S, \tag{2.58}$$

$$\Pi\Gamma^i = \Gamma^i\Pi = \Pi S = S\Pi = 0. \tag{2.59}$$

Now we are going to determine under which conditions the boundary-value problem is strongly elliptic [1].

First of all, the leading symbol of the operator F should be elliptic in the interior of M. The leading symbol of the operator F reads

$$\sigma_L(F;x,\xi) = |\xi|^2 \cdot I \equiv g^{\mu\nu}(x)\xi_\mu\xi_\nu \cdot I, \tag{2.60}$$

where $\xi \in T^*M$ is a cotangent vector. Of course, for a positive-definite non-singular metric the leading symbol is non-degenerate for $\xi \neq 0$. Moreover, for a complex λ which does not lie on the positive real axis, $\lambda \in \mathbf{C} - \mathbf{R}_+$ ($\mathbf{R}_+$ being the set of positive numbers),

$$\det\left(\sigma_L(F;x,\xi) - \lambda\right) = (|\xi|^2 - \lambda)^{\dim V} \neq 0. \tag{2.61}$$

This equals zero only for $\xi = \lambda = 0$. Thus, the leading symbol of the operator F is *elliptic.*

Second, the so-called *strong ellipticity condition* should be satisfied [1, 10]. As we already noted above, there is a natural grading in the vector bundles W_F and W'_F which reflects simply the number of normal derivatives of a section of the bundle [1]. The boundary operator B_F (2.25) is said to have the *graded order* 0. Its *graded leading symbol* is defined by [1, 10]

$$\sigma_g(B_F) \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \Pi & 0 \\ iT & (I - \Pi) \end{pmatrix}, \tag{2.62}$$

where, by virtue of (2.57),

$$T = -i\sigma_L(\Lambda) = \Gamma^j\zeta_j, \tag{2.63}$$

$\zeta \in T^*\partial M$ being a cotangent vector on the boundary. By virtue of (2.58) the matrix T is anti-self-adjoint,

$$\bar{T} = -T, \tag{2.64}$$

and satisfies the conditions

$$\Pi T = T\Pi = 0. \tag{2.65}$$

To define the strong ellipticity condition we take the leading symbol $\sigma_L(F;\hat{x},r,\zeta,\omega)$ of the operator F, substitute $r = 0$ and $\omega \to -i\partial_r$ and consider the following ordinary differential equation for a $\varphi \in C^\infty(V, \partial M \times \mathbf{R}_+)$:

$$\left[\sigma_L(F;\hat{x},0,\zeta,-i\partial_r) - \lambda \cdot I\right]\varphi(r) = 0, \tag{2.66}$$

with an asymptotic condition

$$\lim_{r\to\infty}\varphi(r) = 0, \tag{2.67}$$

where $\zeta \in T^*\partial M$, $\lambda \in \mathbf{C} - \mathbf{R}_+$ is a complex number which does not lie on the positive real axis, and $(\zeta, \lambda) \neq (0,0)$.

The boundary-value problem (F, B) is said to be *strongly elliptic* [10, p.415] with respect to the cone $\mathbf{C} - \mathbf{R}_+$ if for every $\zeta \in T^*\partial M$, $\lambda \in \mathbf{C} - \mathbf{R}_+$, $(\zeta,\lambda) \neq (0,0)$, and $\psi' \in C^\infty(W', \partial M)$ there is a *unique* solution φ to the equation (2.66) subject to the condition (2.67) and satisfying

$$\sigma_g(B_F)(\hat{x},\zeta)\psi(\varphi) = \psi', \tag{2.68}$$

with $\psi(\varphi) \in C^\infty(W, \partial M)$ being the boundary data defined by (2.8) and (2.9).

A purely algebraic formulation of strong ellipticity can also be given, following Gilkey and Smith [10]. For this purpose, let us denote by $W_F^\pm(\zeta, \lambda)$ the subsets of W_F corresponding to boundary data of solutions of Eq. (2.66) vanishing as $r \to \pm\infty$. Decompose $\sigma_L(F; \hat{x}, 0, \zeta, \omega) = p_0\omega^2 + p_1\omega + p_2$, where p_j is homogeneous of order j in ζ. Then the differential equation (2.66) can be rewritten in the form of a first-order system

$$-i\Big[\partial_r + \tau(\zeta, \lambda)\Big] \begin{pmatrix} \varphi \\ \varphi_1 \end{pmatrix} = 0, \tag{2.69}$$

where

$$\tau = i \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ p_0^{-1}(p_2 - \lambda) & p_0^{-1}p_1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2.70}$$

Herefrom one sees that τ does not have any purely-imaginary eigenvalues for $(\zeta, \lambda) \neq (0, 0)$ if (F, B) is strongly elliptic. It is then possible to re-express the strong ellipticity condition by saying that

$$\sigma_g(B_F)(\hat{x}, \zeta) : \; W_F^+(\zeta, \lambda) \to W'_F \tag{2.71}$$

should be an *isomorphism*, for $(\zeta, \lambda) \neq (0, 0), \zeta \in T^*(\partial M), \lambda \in \mathbf{C} - \mathbf{R}_+$ [10, p.416].

For a Laplace-type operator the equation (2.66) takes the form

$$\Big[-\partial_r^2 + |\zeta|^2 - \lambda\Big] \varphi(r) = 0, \tag{2.72}$$

where $|\zeta|^2 \equiv \hat{g}^{ij}(\hat{x})\zeta_i\zeta_j$. The general solution satisfying the decay condition at infinity, $r \to \infty$, reads

$$\varphi(r) = \chi \exp(-\mu r), \tag{2.73}$$

where $\mu \equiv \sqrt{|\zeta|^2 - \lambda}$. Since $(\zeta, \lambda) \neq (0, 0)$ and $\lambda \in \mathbf{C} - \mathbf{R}_+$, one can always choose $\operatorname{Re}\mu > 0$.

The boundary data are now

$$\psi_F(\varphi) = \begin{pmatrix} \chi \\ -\mu\chi \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2.74}$$

Thus, the question of strong ellipticity for Laplace-type operators is reduced to the invertibility of the equations

$$\begin{pmatrix} \Pi & 0 \\ iT & (I - \Pi) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \chi \\ -\mu\chi \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \psi'_0 \\ \psi'_1 \end{pmatrix} \tag{2.75}$$

for arbitrary $\psi'_0 \in C^\infty(W'_0, \partial M), \psi'_1 \in C^\infty(W'_1, \partial M)$. This is obviously equivalent to the algebraic criterion (2.71). The eq. (2.75) can be transformed into (cf. [9])

$$\Pi\chi = \psi'_0, \tag{2.76}$$

$$(\mu I - iT)\chi = \mu\psi'_0 - \psi'_1. \tag{2.77}$$

Remember that $\psi'_F = P_F\tilde{\psi}_F$ with some $\tilde{\psi}_F \in C^\infty(W_F, \partial M)$. Therefore, $(1 - \Pi)\psi'_0 = \Pi\psi'_1 = 0$ and the first equation follows from the second one. Therefore, if the equation

(2.77) has a *unique solution for any* ψ'_0 and ψ'_1, then the boundary-value problem is strongly elliptic. A *necessary and sufficient* condition to achieve this is expressed by the non-degeneracy of the matrix $[\mu I - iT]$, i.e.

$$\det[\mu I - iT] \neq 0, \tag{2.78}$$

for any $(\zeta, \lambda) \neq (0,0)$ and $\lambda \in \mathbf{C} - \mathbf{R}_+$. In this case the solution of eq. (2.77) reads

$$\chi = (\mu I - iT)^{-1}\left[\mu\psi'_0 - \psi'_1\right]. \tag{2.79}$$

Since the matrix iT is self-adjoint, it has only real eigenvalues, in other words the eigenvalues of T^2 are real and *negative*, $T^2 \leq 0$. It is clear that, for any non-real $\lambda \in \mathbf{C}-\mathbf{R}$, $\mu = \sqrt{|\zeta|^2 - \lambda}$ is complex and, therefore, the matrix $[\mu I - iT]$ is non-degenerate. For real negative λ, μ is real and we have $\mu > |\zeta|$. Thus, the condition (2.78) means that the matrix $|\zeta| I - iT$ is positive-definite,

$$|\zeta| I - iT > 0. \tag{2.80}$$

A *sufficient* condition for that reads

$$|\zeta|^2 I + T^2 > 0. \tag{2.81}$$

On the other hand, there holds, of course, $|\zeta|^2 I + T^2 \leq |\zeta|^2$. The eq. (2.81) means that the absolute values of all eigenvalues of the matrix (iT), both positive and negative, are smaller than $|\zeta|$, whereas (2.80) means that only the positive eigenvalues are smaller than $|\zeta|$, but says nothing about the negative ones. A similar inequality has been derived in [11], but in that case the boundary operator does not include the effect of Π, following [3, 12].

This proves the following theorem:

Theorem 3 *Let F be a Laplace-type operator defined by (2.3), and B_F the generalized boundary operator given by (2.25) with the operator Λ defined by (2.57). Let $\zeta \in T^*\partial M$ be a cotangent vector on the boundary and $T \equiv \Gamma^j \zeta_j$. The boundary-value problem (F, B_F) is strongly elliptic with respect to $\mathbf{C} - \mathbf{R}_+$ if and only if for any non-vanishing $\zeta \neq 0$ the matrix $|\zeta| I - iT$ is positive-definite, i.e. $|\zeta| I - iT > 0$.*

2.3.2 Dirac-type operator

The question of strong ellipticity for boundary-value problems involving Dirac-type operators can also be studied. As is well known, the leading symbol of a Dirac-type operator reads

$$\sigma_L(D;\xi) = -\Gamma(\xi). \tag{2.82}$$

Since the square of a Dirac-type operator is a Laplace-type operator, it is clear that the leading symbol $\sigma_L(D;x,\xi)$ is non-degenerate in the interior of M for $\xi \neq 0$. Moreover, for a complex λ one finds

$$\left[\sigma_L(D;\xi) - \lambda I\right]^{-1} = \left[\sigma_L(D;\xi) + \lambda I\right]\frac{1}{|\xi|^2 - \lambda^2}. \tag{2.83}$$

Therefore, $[\sigma_L(D;\xi)-\lambda I]$ is non-degenerate when $|\xi|^2-\lambda^2\neq 0$. But this vanishes only for $\mathrm{Im}\,\lambda=0$ and $\mathrm{Re}\,\lambda=\pm|\xi|$ and *arbitrary* ξ. Thus, for $(\xi,\lambda)\neq(0,0)$ and $\lambda\in\mathbf{C}-\mathbf{R}_+-\mathbf{R}_-$, $[\sigma_L(D;\xi)-\lambda I]$ is non-degenerate.

The boundary-value problem for a Dirac-type operator D is strongly elliptic if there exists a unique solution of the equation

$$[i\Gamma(N)\partial_r-\Gamma(\zeta)-\lambda I]\,\varphi(r)=0, \tag{2.84}$$

for any $(\zeta,\lambda)\neq(0,0)$, $\lambda\notin\mathbf{R}_+\cup\mathbf{R}_-$, such that

$$\lim_{r\to\infty}\varphi(r)=0, \tag{2.85}$$

$$P_D\psi_D(\varphi)=\psi'_D, \tag{2.86}$$

for any $\psi'_D\in W'_D$.

The general solution of (2.84) satisfying the decay condition at infinity reads

$$\varphi(r)=\chi\exp(-\mu r), \tag{2.87}$$

where now $\mu\equiv\sqrt{|\zeta|^2-\lambda^2}$. Again, since $(\zeta,\lambda)\neq(0,0)$, $\lambda\in\mathbf{C}-\mathbf{R}_+-\mathbf{R}_-$, the root can be always defined by $\mathrm{Re}\,\mu>0$. The constant prefactor χ should satisfy the equation

$$(X-\lambda I)\chi=0, \tag{2.88}$$

where

$$X\equiv\sigma_L(D;i\mu N,\zeta)=-i\mu\Gamma(N)-\Gamma(\zeta), \tag{2.89}$$

and the boundary condition

$$P_D\chi=\psi'_D, \tag{2.90}$$

with some $\psi'_D=P_D\tilde\psi_0$, $\tilde\psi_0\in W_0$. The eqs. (2.88), (2.90) are reduced to

$$\chi=\psi'_D+\chi_-, \tag{2.91}$$

$$[X+\lambda(2P_D-I)]\,\chi_-=-(X-\lambda I)\psi'_D. \tag{2.92}$$

Note that, since $P_D\chi_-$ vanishes, the coefficient of P_D in Eq. (2.92) is arbitrary, and is set equal to 2 for convenience. Thus, the question of strong ellipticity for a Dirac-type operator is reduced to the matrix $[X+\lambda(2P_D-I)]$ being non-degenerate,

$$\det\,[X+\lambda(2P_D-I)]\neq 0, \tag{2.93}$$

for any $(\zeta,\lambda)\neq(0,0)$, $\lambda\in\mathbf{C}-\mathbf{R}_+-\mathbf{R}_-$. If this is satisfied, then the solution reads

$$\chi=2\lambda\,[X+\lambda(2P_D-I)]^{-1}\,\psi'_D. \tag{2.94}$$

Let us set $(2P_D-I)\equiv\eta$ and let us compute the square of the matrix $[X+\lambda\eta]$. For the boundary projectors defined by (2.54)–(2.56) the matrix η is either $\eta=\Gamma(N)$, $\eta=\Gamma(u)/|u|$ with some $u\in T^*\partial M$ or (in even dimension m only) is exactly the chirality operator $\eta=C$

(see (2.48)–(2.50)). By using the properties (2.5) of the Clifford algebra and those of the chirality operator η (see (2.51)–(2.53)), we compute

$$[X+\lambda C]^2 = 2\lambda^2 I, \tag{2.95}$$

and

$$\left[X+\lambda\frac{1}{|u|}\Gamma(u)\right]^2 = 2\lambda\left[\lambda-\frac{g(\zeta,u)}{|u|}\right]I. \tag{2.96}$$

We see that, in both cases, the matrix $[X+\lambda(2P_D-I)]$ is non-degenerate for any $(\zeta,\lambda)\neq(0,0)$ and any non-vanishing λ that does not lie on the real axis.

Further, we find also

$$[X+\lambda\Gamma(N)]^2 = 2\lambda(\lambda-i\mu)I. \tag{2.97}$$

Bearing in mind that $\mu\equiv\sqrt{|\zeta|^2-\lambda^2}$, we see that this does not vanish for any $\zeta\neq 0$. However, for $\zeta=0$ and *arbitrary* λ, with $\operatorname{Im}\lambda>0$, this equals zero. Thus, the boundary projector $P_D=(I\pm\Gamma(N))/2$ does not lead to strong ellipticity, which only holds for $\operatorname{Im}\lambda<0$.

Thus, we have proven

Theorem 4 *The boundary-value problem* (D,B_D)*, where* D *is a Dirac-type operator and* B_D *is a projector taking the forms (2.56), or (2.55), or (2.54), is strongly elliptic with respect to* $\mathbf{C}-\{0\}$, $\mathbf{C}-\mathbf{R}$ *and the lower half-plane* $\operatorname{Im}\lambda<0$*, respectively.*

3 Resolvent and heat kernel

Let w be a sufficiently large negative constant and $\lambda\in\mathbf{C}$, $\operatorname{Re}\lambda<w$, be a complex number with a sufficiently large negative real part. Then the resolvent $G(\lambda)=(F-\lambda I)^{-1}: L^2(V,M)\rightarrow L^2(V,M)$ of the strongly elliptic boundary-value problem (F,B) is well defined. The *resolvent kernel* is a section of the tensor product of the vector bundles V and V^* over the tensor-product manifold $M\times M$, defined by the equation

$$(F-\lambda I)G(\lambda|x,y)=\delta(x,y) \tag{3.1}$$

with the boundary conditions

$$B_F\psi[G(\lambda|x,y)]=0, \tag{3.2}$$

where $\delta(x,y)$ is the covariant Dirac distribution, which is nothing but the kernel of the identity operator. Hereafter all differential operators as well as the boundary data map act on the *first* argument of the resolvent kernel (and the heat kernel), unless otherwise stated. This equation, together with the condition

$$\overline{G(\lambda|x,y)}=G(\lambda^*|y,x), \tag{3.3}$$

which follows from the self-adjointness of the operator F, completely determine the resolvent kernel.

Similarly, for $t > 0$ the heat semi-group operator $U(t) = \exp(-tF) :\ L^2(V, M) \to L^2(V, M)$ is well defined. The kernel of this operator, called heat kernel, is defined by the equation

$$(\partial_t + F)U(t|x, y) = 0 \tag{3.4}$$

with the initial condition

$$U(0|x, y) = \delta(x, y), \tag{3.5}$$

the boundary condition

$$B_F\psi[U(t|x, y)] = 0. \tag{3.6}$$

and the self-adjointness condition

$$\overline{U(t|x, y)} = U(t|y, x). \tag{3.7}$$

As is well known [1], the heat kernel and the resolvent kernel are related by the Laplace transform:

$$G(\lambda|x, y) = \int\limits_0^\infty dt e^{t\lambda} U(t|x, y), \tag{3.8}$$

$$U(t|x, y) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int\limits_{w-i\infty}^{w+i\infty} d\lambda e^{-t\lambda} G(\lambda|x, y). \tag{3.9}$$

Also, it is well known [1] that the heat kernel $U(t|x, y)$ is a smooth function near diagonal of $M \times M$ and has a well defined diagonal value $U(t|x, x)$, and the functional trace

$$\mathrm{Tr}_{L^2} \exp(-tF) = \int_M d\mathrm{vol}\,(x)\mathrm{tr}_V U(t|x, x). \tag{3.10}$$

Moreover, the functional trace has an asymptotic expansion as $t \to 0^+$

$$\mathrm{Tr}_{L^2} \exp(-tF) \sim (4\pi t)^{-m/2} \sum_{k\ge 0} t^{k/2} A_{k/2}(F, B_F), \tag{3.11}$$

and the corresponding expansion of the functional trace for the resolvent as $\lambda \to -\infty$ reads

$$\mathrm{Tr}_{L^2} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial\lambda}\right)^n G(\lambda) \sim (4\pi)^{-m/2} \sum_{k\ge 0} \Gamma[(k-m)/2+n+1](-\lambda)^{(m-k)/2-n-1} A_{k/2}(F, B_F), \tag{3.12}$$

for $n \ge m/2$. Here $A_{k/2}(F, B_F)$ are the famous so-called (*global*) heat-kernel coefficients (sometimes called also Minakshisundaram-Plejel or Seeley coefficients). The zeroth-order coefficient is very well known:

$$A_0 = \int\limits_M d\mathrm{vol}\,(x)\mathrm{tr}_V I = \mathrm{vol}\,(M) \cdot \dim(V). \tag{3.13}$$

It is independent of the operator F and of the boundary conditions. The higher order coefficients have the following general form:

$$A_{k/2}(F, B_F) = \int\limits_M d\mathrm{vol}\,(x)\mathrm{tr}_V a_{k/2}(F|x) + \int\limits_{\partial M} d\mathrm{vol}\,(\hat{x})\mathrm{tr}_V b_{k/2}(F, B_F|\hat{x}), \tag{3.14}$$

where $a_{k/2}$ and $b_{k/2}$ are the (*local*) *interior* and *boundary* heat-kernel coefficients. The interior coefficients do *not* depend on the boundary conditions B_F. It is well known that the interior coefficients of half-integer order, $a_{k+1/2}$, vanish [1]. The integer order coefficients a_k are calculated for Laplace-type operators up to a_4 [13]. The boundary coefficients $b_{k/2}(F, B_F)$ do depend on *both* the operator F and the boundary operator B_F. They are far more complicated because in addition to the geometry of the manifold M they depend essentially on the geometry of the boundary ∂M. For Laplace-type operators they are known for the usual boundary conditions (Dirichlet, Neumann, or mixed version of them) up to $b_{5/2}$ [2, 14]. For generalized boundary conditions including tangential derivatives, to the best of our knowledge, they are not known at all. Only some special cases have been studied in the literature [3, 11, 12].

We are going to calculate below the next-to-leading coefficient $A_{1/2}(F, B_F)$ for the generalized boundary conditions. To do this, and also to study the role of the ellipticity condition, we will construct an approximation to the heat kernel $U(t|x, y)$ near the diagonal, i.e. for x close to y and for $t \to 0^+$. Since the heat kernel and resolvent kernel are connected by the Laplace transform, this is equivalent to studying an approximation to the resolvent kernel $G(\lambda|x, y)$ near the diagonal and for large negative $\lambda \to -\infty$ (this leads, in turn, to an approximate inverse of $F - \lambda I$, called a *parametrix*).

Let us stress here that we are not going to provide a rigorous construction of the resolvent with all the estimates, which, for the boundary-value problem, is a task that would require a separate paper. For a complete and mathematically rigorous exposition the reader is referred to the classical papers [10, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19].

Here we keep instead to a pragmatic approach and will describe briefly how the approximate resolvent kernel for $\lambda \to -\infty$, and hence the heat kernel for $t \to 0^+$ can be constructed, and then will calculate both kernels in the leading approximation. This will allow us to compute the heat-kernel coefficient $A_{1/2}$.

First of all, we decompose both kernels into two parts

$$G(\lambda|x, y) = G_\infty(\lambda|x, y) + G_B(\lambda|x, y), \tag{3.15}$$

$$U(t|x, y) = U_\infty(t|x, y) + U_B(t|x, y). \tag{3.16}$$

Then we construct *different* approximations for G_∞ and G_B and, analogously, for U_∞ and U_B. The first parts $G_\infty(\lambda|x, y)$ and $U_\infty(t|x, y)$ are approximated by the usual asymptotic expansion of the resolvent and the heat kernel in the case of compact manifolds *without boundary* when $x \to y$, $\lambda \to -\infty$ and $t \to 0^+$. This means that effectively one introduces a small expansion parameter ε reflecting the fact that the points x and y are close to each other, the parameter t is small and the parameter λ is negative and large. This can be done by fixing a point x', choosing the normal coordinates at this point (with $g_{\mu\nu}(x') = \delta_{\mu\nu}$) and scaling

$$x \to x' + \varepsilon(x - x'), \qquad y \to x' + \varepsilon(y - x'), \qquad t \to \varepsilon^2 t, \qquad \lambda \to \varepsilon^{-2}\lambda \tag{3.17}$$

and expanding into an asymptotic series in ε. If one uses the Fourier transform, then the corresponding momenta $\xi \in T^*M$ are large and scale according to

$$\xi \to \varepsilon^{-1}\xi. \tag{3.18}$$

This construction is standard [1] and we do not repeat it here. One can also use a completely covariant method [13, 20]. Probably the most convenient formula for the asymptotics as $t \to 0^+$, among many equivalent ones, is [13, 20]

$$U_\infty(t|x,y) \sim (4\pi t)^{-m/2} \exp\left(-\frac{\sigma}{2t}\right) \Delta^{1/2} \sum_{k\geq 0} t^k a_k, \tag{3.19}$$

where $\sigma = \sigma(x,y) = r^2(x,y)/2$ is one half the geodesic distance between x and y, $\Delta = \Delta(x,y) = g^{-1/2}(x) g^{-1/2}(y) \det\left(-\partial^x_\mu \partial^y_\nu \sigma(x,y)\right)$ is the corresponding Van Vleck-Morette determinant, $g = \det g_{\mu\nu}$, and $a_k = a_k(x,y)$ are the off-diagonal heat-kernel coefficients. These coefficients satisfy certain differential recursion relations which can be solved in form of a covariant Taylor series near diagonal [13]. On the diagonal the asymptotic expansion of the heat kernel reads

$$U_\infty(t|x,x) \sim (4\pi t)^{-m/2} \sum_{k\geq 0} t^k a_k(x,x). \tag{3.20}$$

The explicit formulas for the diagonal values of a_k are known up to $k = 4$ [13]. This asymptotic expansion can be integrated over the manifold M to get

$$\int_M d\mathrm{vol}\,(x) \mathrm{tr}_V U_\infty(t|x,x) \sim (4\pi t)^{-m/2} \sum_{k\geq 0} t^k \int_M d\mathrm{vol}\,(x) \mathrm{tr}_V\, a_k(x,x). \tag{3.21}$$

Thus, integrating the diagonal of U_∞ gives the interior terms in the heat-kernel asymptotics.

The asymptotic expansion of $G_\infty(\lambda|x,y)$ for $\lambda \to -\infty$ is obtained from here by the Laplace transform (3.8)

$$G_\infty(\lambda|x,y) \sim (4\pi)^{-m/2} \Delta^{1/2} \sum_{k\geq 0} 2 \left(\frac{\sigma}{-2\lambda}\right)^{(2k+2-m)/4} K_{k+1-m/2}(\sqrt{-2\lambda\sigma}) a_k, \tag{3.22}$$

where $K_\nu(z) = \pi/[2\sin(\nu\pi)][I_{-\nu}(z) - I_\nu(z)]$ is the McDonald function (the modified Bessel function of third kind). It is singular on the diagonal $x = y$. However, for a sufficiently large n, $n \geq m/2$, it becomes regular at the diagonal resulting in the asymptotic series as $\lambda \to -\infty$

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_M d\mathrm{vol}\,(x) \mathrm{tr}_V \left\{ \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial\lambda}\right)^n G_\infty(\lambda|x,y) \right\}\Bigg|_{x=y} \\ &\sim (4\pi)^{-m/2} \sum_{k\geq 0} \Gamma\left(k - \frac{m}{2} + n + 1\right) (-\lambda)^{\frac{m}{2}-k-n-1} \int_M d\mathrm{vol}\,(x) \mathrm{tr}_V\, a_k(x,x). \end{aligned} \tag{3.23}$$

For a *strongly elliptic* boundary-value problem the diagonal of the boundary part $U_B(t|x,x)$ is *exponentially small*, i.e. of order $\sim \exp(-r^2(x)/t)$, where $r(x)$ is the normal geodesic distance to the boundary, as $t \to 0^+$ if $x \notin \partial M$. So, it does not contribute to the asymptotic expansion of the heat-kernel diagonal outside the boundary as $t \to$

0^+. Therefore, the asymptotic expansion of the total heat-kernel diagonal outside the boundary is determined only by U_∞

$$U(t|x,x) \sim (4\pi t)^{-m/2} \sum_{k\geq 0} t^k a_k(x,x), \qquad x \notin \partial M. \tag{3.24}$$

The point is, the coefficients of the asymptotic expansion of the diagonal of the boundary part $U_B(t|x,x)$ as $t \to 0^+$ behave near the boundary like the one-dimensional Dirac distribution $\delta(r(x))$ and its derivatives. Thus, the *integral* over the manifold M of the boundary part $U_B(t|x,x)$ has an asymptotic expansion as $t \to 0^+$ with non-vanishing coefficients in form of the integrals over the boundary. Therefore, it determines the local boundary contributions $b_{k/2}$ to the heat-kernel coefficients $A_{k/2}$. It is well known that the coefficient $A_{1/2}$ is a purely boundary contribution [1]. It is almost obvious that it can be evaluated by integrating the fibre trace of the boundary contribution U_B of the heat kernel in the leading order.

Of course, this approximation is obtained *without* taking into account the boundary conditions. Therefore, G_∞ satisfies approximately the equation (3.1) but does not satisfy the boundary conditions (3.2). This means that the compensating term $G_B(\lambda|x,y)$ is defined by the equation

$$(F - \lambda I) G_B(\lambda|x,y) = 0 \tag{3.25}$$

with the boundary condition

$$B_F \psi \left[G_\infty(\lambda|x,y) + G_B(\lambda|x,y) \right] = 0. \tag{3.26}$$

Analogously, $U_B(t|x,y)$ is defined by

$$(\partial_t + F) U_B(t|x,y) = 0 \tag{3.27}$$

with the initial condition

$$U_B(0|x,y) = 0, \tag{3.28}$$

and the boundary condition

$$B_F \psi \left[U_\infty(t|x,y) + U_B(t|x,y) \right] = 0. \tag{3.29}$$

The most difficult problem is to find the compensating terms $G_B(\lambda|x,y)$ and $U_B(t|x,y)$. These functions are important only near the boundary where they behave like distributions when $t \to 0^+$ or $\lambda \to -\infty$. Since the points x and y are close to the boundary the coordinates $r(x)$ and $r(y)$ are small *separately*, hence not only the difference $[r(x) - r(y)]$ but also the sum $[r(x) + r(y)]$ is small. This means that we must additionally scale $r(x) \to \varepsilon r(x)$, $r(y) \to \varepsilon r(y)$. By contrast, the point $\hat{x}'$ is kept fixed on the boundary, so the coordinates $\hat{x}'$ do not scale at all: $\hat{x}' \to \hat{x}'$.

Thus, we shall scale the coordinates $x = (\hat{x}, r(x))$ and $y = (\hat{y}, r(y))$, the parameters t and λ and momenta $\xi = (\zeta, \omega) \in T^*M$, with $\zeta \in T^*\partial M$ and $\omega \in T^*\mathbf{R}$, according to

$$\hat{x} \to \hat{x}' + \varepsilon(\hat{x} - \hat{x}'), \qquad \hat{y} \to \hat{x}' + \varepsilon(\hat{y} - \hat{x}'), \qquad r(x) \to \varepsilon r(x), \qquad r(y) \to \varepsilon r(y), \tag{3.30}$$

$$t \to \varepsilon^2 t, \qquad \lambda \to \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}\lambda, \qquad \zeta \to \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\zeta, \qquad \omega \to \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\omega. \tag{3.31}$$

The corresponding differential operators are scaled by

$$\hat\partial \to \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\hat\partial, \qquad \partial_r \to \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\partial_r, \qquad \partial_t \to \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}\partial_t, \qquad \partial_\lambda \to \varepsilon^2\partial_\lambda. \tag{3.32}$$

We will call this transformation just *scaling* and denote the scaled objects by an index ε, e.g. G^ε_B. The scaling parameter ε will be considered as a small parameter in the theory and we will use it to expand everything in power series in ε. We will *not* take care about the convergence properties of these expansions and take them as *formal* power series. In fact, they are asymptotic expansions as $\varepsilon \to 0$. At the very end of calculations we set $\varepsilon = 1$. The non-scaled objects, i.e. those with $\varepsilon = 1$, will not have the index ε, e.g. $G^\varepsilon_B|_{\varepsilon=1} = G_B$. Another way of doing this is by saying that we will expand all quantities in the homogeneous functions of the coordinates $(\hat x - \hat x')$, $(\hat y - \hat x')$, $r(x)$, $r(y)$, the momenta $\xi = (\zeta, \omega)$ and the parameters t, λ.

First of all, we expand the scaled operator F^ε in power series in ε

$$F^\varepsilon \sim \sum_{n\geq 0} \varepsilon^{n-2} F_n, \tag{3.33}$$

where F_n are second-order differential operators with homogeneous symbols. The boundary operator requires a more careful handling. Since half of the boundary data (2.8) contain normal derivatives, formally $\psi_0 = \varphi|_{r=0}$ and $\psi_1 = \partial_r\varphi|_{r=0}$, (2.9), would be of different order in ε. To make them of the same order we have to assume an additional factor ε in all $\psi_1 \in C^\infty(W_1, \partial M)$. Thus, we define the *graded scaling* of the boundary data map by

$$\psi^\varepsilon(\varphi) = \begin{pmatrix} \psi^\varepsilon_0(\varphi) \\ \varepsilon\psi^\varepsilon_1(\varphi) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \varphi(\hat x, r)|_{r=0} \\ \partial_r\varphi(\hat x, r)|_{r=0} \end{pmatrix} = \psi(\varphi), \tag{3.34}$$

so that the boundary data map ψ *does not scale* at all. This leads to an additional factor ε in the operator Λ determining the boundary operator B_F (2.25). Thus, we define the *graded scaling* of the boundary operator by

$$B^\varepsilon_F = \begin{pmatrix} \Pi^\varepsilon & 0 \\ \varepsilon\Lambda^\varepsilon & I - \Pi^\varepsilon \end{pmatrix}, \tag{3.35}$$

which has the following asymptotic expansion in ε:

$$B^\varepsilon_F \sim \sum_{n\geq 0} \varepsilon^n B_{F(n)}, \tag{3.36}$$

where $B_{F(n)}$ are first-order tangential operators with homogeneous symbols. Of course,

$$F_0 = -\partial_r^2 - \hat\partial^2, \tag{3.37}$$

$$B_{F(0)} = \begin{pmatrix} \Pi_0 & 0 \\ \Lambda_0 & I - \Pi_0 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{3.38}$$

where

$$\hat{\partial}^2 = \hat{g}^{jk}(\hat{x}')\hat{\partial}_j\hat{\partial}_k, \qquad \Lambda_0 = \Gamma^j(\hat{x}')\hat{\partial}_j, \qquad \Pi_0 = \Pi(\hat{x}'). \tag{3.39}$$

Note that all leading-order operators F_0, $B_{F(0)}$ and Λ_0 have *constant* coefficients and, therefore, are very easy to handle. This procedure is called sometimes "freezing the coefficients of the differential operator".

The subsequent strategy is rather simple. Expand the scaled resolvent kernel in ε

$$G^{\varepsilon}_{\infty} \sim \sum_{n\geq 0} \varepsilon^{2-m+n} G_{\infty(n)}, \tag{3.40}$$

$$G^{\varepsilon}_{B} \sim \sum_{n\geq 0} \varepsilon^{2-m+n} G_{B(n)}, \tag{3.41}$$

and substitute into the scaled version of the equation (3.25) and the boundary condition (3.26). Then, by equating the like powers in ε one gets an infinite set of recursive equations which determine all $G_{B(n)}$. The zeroth-order term $G_{B(0)}$ is defined by

$$(F_0 - \lambda I) G_{B(0)} = 0, \tag{3.42}$$

and the boundary conditions,

$$B_{F(0)}\psi\left(G_{\infty(0)} + G_{B(0)}\right) = 0, \tag{3.43}$$

where F_0 and $B_{F(0)}$ are defined by (3.37)-(3.39). The higher orders are determined from

$$(F_0 - \lambda I) G_{B(k)} = -\sum_{n=1}^{k} F_n G_{B(k-n)}, \qquad k = 1, 2, \dots, \tag{3.44}$$

and the corresponding boundary conditions,

$$B_{F(0)}\psi\left(G_{\infty(k)} + G_{B(k)}\right) = -\sum_{n=1}^{k} B_{F(n)}\psi\left(G_{\infty(k-n)} + G_{B(k-n)}\right). \tag{3.45}$$

The $G_{\infty(n)}$ are obtained simply by expanding the scaled version of (3.22) in power series in ε. The operator F_0 is a partial differential operator, but fortunately, has constant coefficients. By using the Fourier transform in the boundary coordinates $(\hat{x} - \hat{x}')$ it reduces to an *ordinary* differential operator of second order. This enables one to find easily its resolvent. We will do this in next subsection below. Before doing this, let us stress that the same procedure can be applied to get the boundary part $U_B(t|x, y)$ of the heat kernel.

3.1 Leading order resolvent

In this subsection we determine the resolvent to leading order, i.e. $G_0 = G_{\infty(0)} + G_{B(0)}$. As we already outlined above, we fix a point $\hat{x}' \in \partial M$ on the boundary and the normal coordinates at this point (with $\hat{g}_{ik}(\hat{x}') = \delta_{ik}$), take the tangent space $T\partial M$ and identify the manifold M with $M_0 \equiv T\partial M \times \mathbf{R}_+$. By using the explicit form of the zeroth-order operators F_0, B_0 and Λ_0 given by (3.37)-(3.39) we obtain the equation

$$\left(-\partial_r^2 - \hat{\partial}^2 - \lambda\right) G_0(\lambda|x,y) = \delta(x-y), \tag{3.46}$$

and the boundary conditions

$$\Pi_0 G_0(\lambda|x,y)\Big|_{r(x)=0} = 0, \tag{3.47}$$

$$(I - \Pi_0)\left(\partial_r + i\Gamma_0^j \hat{\partial}_j\right) G_0(\lambda|x,y)\Big|_{r(x)=0} = 0, \tag{3.48}$$

where $\Pi_0 = \Pi(\hat{x}'), \Gamma_0^j = \Gamma^j(\hat{x}')$. Hereafter the differential operators always act on the first argument of a kernel. Moreover, for simplicity of notation, we will denote Π_0 and Γ_0 just by Π and Γ^j and omit the dependence of all geometric objects on $\hat{x}'$. To leading order this cannot cause any misunderstanding. Further to this, the resolvent kernel should be bounded,

$$\lim_{r(x)\to\infty} G_0(\lambda|x,y) = \lim_{r(y)\to\infty} G_0(\lambda|x,y) = 0, \tag{3.49}$$

and self-adjoint,

$$\overline{G_0(\lambda|x,y)} = G_0(\lambda^*|y,x). \tag{3.50}$$

Since the above boundary-value problem has constant coefficients, by using the Fourier transform in $(\hat{x} - \hat{y})$

$$G_{(0)}(\lambda|x,y) = \int\limits_{\mathbf{R}^{m-1}} \frac{d\zeta}{(2\pi)^{m-1}} e^{i\zeta\cdot(\hat{x}-\hat{y})} \tilde{G}_{(0)}(\lambda|\zeta, r(x), r(y)), \tag{3.51}$$

where $\zeta \in T^*\partial M$, $\zeta \cdot \hat{x} \equiv \zeta_j \hat{x}^j$, we obtain an ordinary differential equation

$$\left(-\partial_r^2 + |\zeta|^2 - \lambda\right) \tilde{G}_0(\lambda|\zeta, r(x), r(y)) = \delta[\rho(x,y)], \tag{3.52}$$

where $|\zeta|^2 = g^{ij}(\hat{x}')\zeta_i\zeta_j$,

$$\rho(x,y) = r(x) - r(y), \tag{3.53}$$

the boundary conditions

$$\Pi\tilde{G}_0(\lambda|\zeta, 0, r(y)) = 0, \tag{3.54}$$

$$(I - \Pi)\left(\partial_r + iT\right) \tilde{G}_0(\lambda|\zeta, r(x), r(y))\Big|_{r(x)=0} = 0, \tag{3.55}$$

and self-adjointness condition

$$\overline{G_0(\lambda|\zeta, r(x), r(y))} = G_0(\lambda^*|\zeta, r(y), r(x)). \tag{3.56}$$

Here T is an anti-self-adjoint matrix

$$T = T(\zeta) = \Gamma\cdot\zeta = \Gamma^j\zeta_j, \qquad \bar{T} = -T, \tag{3.57}$$

satisfying the conditions

$$(I - \Pi)T = T(I - \Pi) = T. \tag{3.58}$$

The first 'free' part of the solution of this problem $\tilde{G}_{\infty(0)}$, which gives the resolvent kernel on the line $\mathbf{R}$, is almost obvious. Since the equation (3.52) has constant coefficients and there are no boundary conditions, its solution depends only on the difference $\rho(x,y) = r(x) - r(y)$

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{G}_{\infty(0)}(\lambda|\zeta, r(x), r(y)) &= \frac{1}{2\mu}\left\{\theta[\rho(x,y)]e^{-\mu\rho(x,y)} + \theta[-\rho(x,y)]e^{\mu\rho(x,y)}\right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{2\mu}e^{-\mu|\rho(x,y)|}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.59}$$

where

$$\mu \equiv \sqrt{|\zeta|^2 - \lambda}, \qquad \mathrm{Re}\,\mu > 0, \tag{3.60}$$

and θ is the usual step function

$$\theta(x) \equiv \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x > 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } x < 0. \end{cases} \tag{3.61}$$

The boundary part $\tilde{G}_{B(0)}$ takes into account the boundary conditions (3.54) and (3.55). On requiring regularity at infinity and self-adjointness of the kernel, we can write down the solution up to a constant *self-adjoint* matrix $h = \bar{h}$,

$$\tilde{G}_{B(0)}(\lambda|\zeta, r(x), r(y)) = \frac{1}{2\mu}h(\mu;\zeta)\, e^{-\mu[r(x)+r(y)]}. \tag{3.62}$$

¿From eqs. (3.59)-(3.62) we find

$$\tilde{G}_0(\lambda|\zeta, 0, r(y)) = \frac{1}{2\mu}(I+h)e^{-\mu r(y)}, \qquad \partial_r \tilde{G}_0(\lambda|\zeta, r(x), r(y))\Big|_{r(x)=0} = \frac{1}{2}(I-h)e^{-\mu r(y)}. \tag{3.63}$$

Taking into account the conditions (3.57)-(3.58) we reduce the boundary conditions to the form

$$\Pi(I+h) = 0, \tag{3.64}$$

$$(I-\Pi)\mu(I-h) + iT(I+h) = 0. \tag{3.65}$$

Since h is self-adjoint and $T\Pi = \Pi T = 0$ it must have the form $h = \alpha\Pi + (I-\Pi)\beta(T)(I-\Pi)$, where α is a constant and β is a matrix depending on T. Substituting this into (3.64) we immediately obtain $\alpha = -1$. From the second boundary condition (3.65) we get

$$(\mu I - iT)\beta = \mu I + iT. \tag{3.66}$$

Since the problem is assumed to be strongly elliptic, the matrix $\mu I - iT$ is invertible for any $(\zeta, \lambda) \neq (0,0)$. Thus, we obtain the solution of the boundary conditions in the form

$$\begin{aligned} h(\mu;\zeta) &= -\Pi + (I-\Pi)(\mu I - iT)^{-1}(\mu I + iT)(I-\Pi) \\ &= I - 2\Pi + 2iT(\mu I - iT)^{-1}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.67}$$

In a particular case of mixed Dirichlet and Neumann boundary conditions, when $\Gamma^j = 0$, this reduces to

$$h = I - 2\Pi. \tag{3.68}$$

Note that the function $h(\mu, \zeta)$ depends actually on the ratio ζ/μ, in other words, it satisfies the homogeneity relation

$$h(s\mu, s\zeta) = h(\mu, \zeta). \tag{3.69}$$

More generally,

$$\tilde{G}_0\left(\frac{1}{t}\lambda\Big|\frac{1}{\sqrt{t}}\zeta, \sqrt{t}\, r(x), \sqrt{t}\, r(y)\right) = \sqrt{t}\tilde{G}_0(\lambda|\zeta, r(x), r(y)) \tag{3.70}$$

This holds for $G_{\infty(0)}$ as well as for $G_{B(0)}$. As a function of λ, $\tilde{G}_{(0)}$ is a meromorphic function with a cut along the positive real axis from $|\zeta|^2$ to ∞. The "free" part $G_{\infty(0)}$ has no other singularities, whereas the boundary part $G_{B(0)}$ has simple poles at the eigenvalues of the matrix $|\zeta|^2 + T^2$. Remember that the strong ellipticity condition 2.80 requires these eigenvalues to be positive and smaller than $|\zeta|^2$, i.e. $0 < |\zeta|^2 + T^2 < |\zeta|^2$.

3.2 Leading order heat kernel

Using $G_0(\lambda|x, y)$, we can also get the zeroth-order heat kernel $U_0(t|x, y)$ by the inverse Laplace transform

$$\begin{aligned} U_0(t|x,y) &= \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int\limits_{w-i\infty}^{w+i\infty} d\lambda\, e^{-t\lambda} G_0(\lambda|x,y) && (3.71)\\ &= \int\limits_{\mathbf{R}^{m-1}} \frac{d\zeta}{(2\pi)^{m-1}} \int\limits_{w-i\infty}^{w+i\infty} \frac{d\lambda}{2\pi i}\, e^{-t\lambda + i\zeta\cdot(\hat{x}-\hat{y})}\tilde{G}_0(\lambda|\zeta, r(x), r(y)) && (3.72)\end{aligned}$$

where w is a negative constant. Now, by scaling the integration variables $\lambda \to \lambda/t$ and $\zeta \to \zeta/\sqrt{t}$ and shifting the contour of integration over λ ($w \to w/t$, which can be done because the integrand is analytic in the left half-plane of λ) and using the homogeneity property we obtain immediately

$$U_0(t|x,y) = (4\pi t)^{-m/2} \int\limits_{\mathbf{R}^{m-1}} \frac{d\zeta}{\pi^{(m-1)/2}}\, e^{i\zeta\cdot(\hat{x}-\hat{y})/\sqrt{t}} \int\limits_{w-i\infty}^{w+i\infty} \frac{d\lambda}{i\sqrt{\pi}}\, e^{-\lambda}\, \tilde{G}_0\left(\lambda\Big|\zeta, \frac{r(x)}{\sqrt{t}}, \frac{r(y)}{\sqrt{t}}\right) \tag{3.73}$$

Next, let us change the variable λ according to

$$\lambda \equiv |\zeta|^2 + \omega^2, \tag{3.74}$$

where $\omega = i\mu$, and, hence, $\mathrm{Im}\,\omega > 0$. In the upper half-plane, $\mathrm{Im}\,\omega > 0$, this change of variables is single valued and well defined. Under this change the cut in the complex plane λ along the positive real axis from $|\zeta|^2$ to ∞, i.e. $\mathrm{Im}\,\lambda = 0, \quad |\zeta|^2 < \mathrm{Re}\,\lambda < \infty$ is mapped onto the whole real axis $\mathrm{Im}\,\omega = 0, \quad -\infty < \mathrm{Re}\,\omega < +\infty$. The interval

$\mathrm{Im}\,\lambda = 0, \quad 0 < \mathrm{Re}\,\lambda < |\zeta|^2$ on the real axis of λ is mapped onto an interval $\mathrm{Re}\,\omega = 0, \quad 0 < \mathrm{Im}\,\omega < |\zeta|$, on the *positive imaginary* axis of ω. As a function of ω the resolvent $\tilde{G}_0$ is a meromorphic function in the upper half plane, $\mathrm{Im}\,\omega > 0$, with simple poles on the interval $\mathrm{Re}\,\omega = 0, \quad 0 < \mathrm{Im}\,\omega < |\zeta|$, on the imaginary axis. The contour of integration in the complex plane of ω is a hyperbola going from $(e^{i3\pi/4})\infty$ through the point $\omega = \sqrt{|\zeta|^2 - w}$ to $(e^{i\pi/4})\infty$. It can be deformed to a contour C that comes from $-\infty + i\varepsilon$, encircles the point $\omega = i|\zeta|$ in the clockwise direction and goes to $+\infty + i\varepsilon$, where ε is an infinitesimal positive parameter. The contour C does *not* cross the interval $\mathrm{Re}\,\omega = 0, \quad 0 < \mathrm{Im}\,\omega < |\zeta|$, on the imaginary axis and is *above* all the singularities of the resolvent.

After such a tranformation we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} U_0(t|x,y) &= (4\pi t)^{-m/2} \int\limits_{\mathbf{R}^{m-1}} \frac{d\zeta}{\pi^{(m-1)/2}} e^{-|\zeta|^2 + i\zeta\cdot(\hat{x}-\hat{y})/\sqrt{t}} \\ &\times \int\limits_C \frac{d\omega}{\sqrt{\pi}}\, e^{-\omega^2}\, 2(-i\omega)\, \tilde{G}_0\left(|\zeta|^2 + \omega^2 \Big| \zeta, \frac{r(x)}{\sqrt{t}}, \frac{r(y)}{\sqrt{t}}\right) \end{aligned} \tag{3.75}$$

Substituting here $\tilde{G}_0$ we find

$$\begin{aligned} U_0(t|x,y) &= (4\pi t)^{-m/2} \int\limits_{\mathbf{R}^{m-1}} \frac{d\zeta}{\pi^{(m-1)/2}} e^{-|\zeta|^2 + i\zeta\cdot(\hat{x}-\hat{y})/\sqrt{t}} \\ &\times \int\limits_C \frac{d\omega}{\sqrt{\pi}}\, e^{-\omega^2} \left\{ e^{i\omega|r(x)-r(y)|/\sqrt{t}} + h(-i\omega;\zeta) e^{i\omega|r(x)+r(y)|/\sqrt{t}} \right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.76}$$

The first "free" part is easily obtained by computing the Gaussian integrals over ω and ζ. We get

$$U_0(t|x,y) = (4\pi t)^{-m/2} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{4t}|x-y|^2\right) + U_{B(0)}(t|x,y), \tag{3.77}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} U_{B(0)}(t|x,y) &= (4\pi t)^{-m/2} \int\limits_{\mathbf{R}^{m-1}} \frac{d\zeta}{\pi^{(m-1)/2}} e^{-|\zeta|^2 + i\zeta\cdot(\hat{x}-\hat{y})/\sqrt{t}} \\ &\times \int\limits_C \frac{d\omega}{\sqrt{\pi}} \exp\left\{-\omega^2 + i\omega \frac{|r(x)+r(y)|}{\sqrt{t}}\right\} \left\{(I - 2\Pi) - 2T(\omega\, I + T)^{-1}\right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.78}$$

Here, the part proportional to $(I - 2\Pi)$ also contains only Gaussian integrals and is easily calculated. Thus (cf. [21])

$$U_{B(0)}(t|x,y) = (4\pi t)^{-m/2} \left\{ \exp\left[-\frac{1}{4t}|\hat{x}-\hat{y}|^2 - \frac{1}{4t}[r(x)+r(y)]^2\right](I - 2\Pi) + \Omega(t|x,y) \right\}, \tag{3.79}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega(t|x,y) &= -2 \int\limits_{\mathbf{R}^{m-1}} \frac{d\zeta}{\pi^{(m-1)/2}} \int\limits_C \frac{d\omega}{\sqrt{\pi}} \exp\left\{-|\zeta|^2 + i\zeta\cdot\frac{(\hat{x}-\hat{y})}{\sqrt{t}} - \omega^2 + i\omega\frac{[r(x)+r(y)]}{\sqrt{t}}\right\} \\ &\times \Gamma\cdot\zeta(\omega\, I + \Gamma\cdot\zeta)^{-1}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.80}$$

where we substituted $T = \Gamma\cdot\zeta \equiv \Gamma^j\zeta_j$.

Herefrom we obtain easily the diagonal value of the heat kernel

$$U_{(0)}(t|x,x) = (4\pi t)^{-m/2}\left\{I + \exp\left(-\frac{r^2(x)}{t}\right)(I-2\Pi) + \Phi(r(x)/\sqrt{t})\right\}, \tag{3.81}$$

where

$$\Phi(z) \quad = \quad -2\int\limits_{\mathbf{R}^{m-1}} \frac{d\zeta}{\pi^{(m-1)/2}} \int\limits_C \frac{d\omega}{\sqrt{\pi}}\, e^{-|\zeta|^2-\omega^2+2i\omega z}\,\Gamma\cdot\zeta(\omega\, I + \Gamma\cdot\zeta)^{-1}. \tag{3.82}$$

Now, by using the representation (remember that $\mathrm{Im}\,(\omega\, I + \Gamma\cdot\zeta) > 0$)

$$(\omega I + \Gamma\cdot\zeta)^{-1} = -2i\int_0^\infty dp\, e^{2ip(\omega I + \Gamma\cdot\zeta)}, \tag{3.83}$$

and computing a Gaussian integral over ω, we obtain

$$\Phi(z) = 2\int\limits_{\mathbf{R}^{m-1}} \frac{d\zeta}{\pi^{(m-1)/2}} \int_0^\infty dp\, e^{-|\zeta|^2-(p+z)^2}\frac{\partial}{\partial p}e^{2ip\Gamma\cdot\zeta}. \tag{3.84}$$

Integrating by parts over p we get

$$\Phi(z) = -2e^{-z^2}I - 2\frac{\partial}{\partial z}\Psi(z), \tag{3.85}$$

where

$$\Psi(z) = \int\limits_{\mathbf{R}^{m-1}} \frac{d\zeta}{\pi^{(m-1)/2}} \int_0^\infty dp\, e^{-|\zeta|^2-(p+z)^2+2ip\Gamma\cdot\zeta}. \tag{3.86}$$

It is not difficult to show that, as $z\to\infty$, the functions $\Psi(z)$ and $\Phi(z)$ are *exponentially small*:

$$\Psi(z) \sim \frac{1}{2z}e^{-z^2}\left[I - \frac{1}{2z^2}(I+\Gamma^2) + \mathrm{O}(z^{-4})\right], \tag{3.87}$$

$$\Phi(z) \sim \frac{1}{z^2}e^{-z^2}\left[-\Gamma^2 + \mathrm{O}(z^{-2})\right], \tag{3.88}$$

where $\Gamma^2 \equiv g_{ij}\Gamma^i\Gamma^j$. For $z=0$, by using the change $\zeta\to-\zeta$, we obtain

$$\Psi(0) = \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2}\int\limits_{\mathbf{R}^{m-1}} \frac{d\zeta}{\pi^{(m-1)/2}}\, e^{-|\zeta|^2-(\Gamma\cdot\zeta)^2}. \tag{3.89}$$

Note that this integral converges when the strong ellipticity condition $(\Gamma\cdot\zeta)^2 + |\zeta|^2 > 0$ is satisfied.

Now, we take the diagonal $U_{(0)}(t|x,x)$ given by (3.81), and integrate over the manifold M. Because the boundary part $U_{B(0)}$ is exponentially small as $r(x)\to\infty$ we can in fact integrate it only over a narrow strip near the boundary, when $0 < r(x) < \delta$. The difference is asymptotically small as $t\to 0^+$. Doing the change of variables $z = r/\sqrt{t}$ we reduce the integration to $0 < z < \delta/\sqrt{t}$. We see, that as $t\to 0^+$ we can integrate over z from 0 to ∞.

The error is asymptotically small as $t \to 0^+$ and does not contribute to the asymptotic expansion of the trace of the heat kernel.

Thus, we obtain

$$\mathrm{Tr}_{\,L^2} U_0(t) \sim (4\pi t)^{-m/2} \left(A_0 + \sqrt{t}\, A_{1/2} + \cdots \right), \tag{3.90}$$

where A_0 is given by (3.13) and

$$A_{1/2} = \int\limits_{\partial M} d\mathrm{vol}\,(\hat{x}) \mathrm{tr}_{\,V} a_{1/2}, \tag{3.91}$$

with

$$a_{1/2} = \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2} \left(I - 2\Pi + \beta_{1/2} \right), \tag{3.92}$$

$$\beta_{1/2} = \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int\limits_0^\infty dz\, \Phi(z). \tag{3.93}$$

Now, using (3.85) and (3.89) and the fact that $\Psi(\infty) = 0$ we get easily

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{1/2} &= -2 + \frac{4}{\sqrt{\pi}} \Psi(0) \\ &= 2 \int\limits_{\mathbf{R}^{m-1}} \frac{d\zeta}{\pi^{(m-1)/2}}\, e^{-|\zeta|^2} \left(e^{-A^{jk}\zeta_j\zeta_k} - I \right), \end{aligned} \tag{3.94}$$

where

$$A^{jk} \equiv \Gamma^{(j}\Gamma^{k)}. \tag{3.95}$$

Eventually,

$$a_{1/2} = \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2} \left\{ I - 2\Pi + 2 \int\limits_{\mathbf{R}^{m-1}} \frac{d\zeta}{\pi^{(m-1)/2}}\, e^{-|\zeta|^2} \left(e^{-A^{jk}\zeta_j\zeta_k} - I \right) \right\}. \tag{3.96}$$

Further calculations of general nature, without knowing the algebraic properties of the matrices A^{jk}, seem to be impossible. One can, however, evaluate the integral in form of an expansion in the matrices A^{jk}, or Γ^i. Using the Gaussian integrals

$$\int\limits_{\mathbf{R}^{m-1}} \frac{d\zeta}{\pi^{(m-1)/2}}\, e^{-|\zeta|^2} \zeta_{i_1} \cdots \zeta_{i_{2n}} = \frac{(2n)!}{n! 2^{2n}} \hat{g}_{(i_1 i_2} \cdots \hat{g}_{i_{2n-1} i_{2n})}, \tag{3.97}$$

we obtain

$$\beta_{1/2} = 2 \sum_{n \ge 1} (-1)^n \frac{(2n)!}{(n!)^2 2^{2n}} \hat{g}_{i_1 i_2} \cdots \hat{g}_{i_{2n-1} i_{2n}} \Gamma^{(i_1} \cdots \Gamma^{i_{2n})}, \tag{3.98}$$

and, therefore,

$$a_{1/2} = \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2} \left\{ I - 2\Pi + 2 \sum_{n \ge 1} (-1)^n \frac{(2n)!}{(n!)^2 2^{2n}} \hat{g}_{i_1 i_2} \cdots \hat{g}_{i_{2n-1} i_{2n}} \Gamma^{(i_1} \cdots \Gamma^{i_{2n})} \right\}. \tag{3.99}$$

Since our main result (3.94) is rather complicated, we now consider a number of particular cases of physical relevance.

1. The simplest case is, of course, when the matrices A^{ij} vanish, $A^{ij}=0$. One then gets the familiar result for mixed boundary conditions [1, 2]

$$\beta_{1/2}=0, \qquad a_{1/2}=\frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2}(I-2\Pi). \tag{3.100}$$

2. The first non-trivial case is when the matrices Γ^i form an Abelian algebra,

$$[\Gamma^i,\Gamma^j]=0. \tag{3.101}$$

   One can then easily compute the integral (3.94) explicitly,

$$\beta_{1/2}=2\left[(I+\Gamma^2)^{-1/2}-1\right]. \tag{3.102}$$

   Therefore

$$a_{1/2}=\frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2}\left\{I-2\Pi+2\left[(I+\Gamma^2)^{-1/2}-I\right]\right\}. \tag{3.103}$$

   In the case $\Pi=0$, this coincides with the result of ref. [3], where the authors considered the particular case of commuting Γ^i matrices (without noting this explicitly).

3. Let us assume that the matrices $A^{jk}=\Gamma^{(j}\Gamma^{k)}$ form an Abelian algebra, i.e.

$$[A^{jk},A^{lm}]=0. \tag{3.104}$$

   The evaluation of the resulting integral over ζ yields

$$\beta_{1/2}=2\left[(\det{}_{T\partial M}[\delta^i{}_j+A^i{}_j])^{-1/2}-I\right], \tag{3.105}$$

   where the determinant $\det{}_{T\partial M}$ is taken over the indices in the tangent space to the boundary (we used $\det\hat{g}=1$). By virtue of (3.92) one gets the final result

$$a_{1/2}=\frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2}\left\{I-2\Pi+2\left[\left(\det{}_{T\partial M}[\delta^i{}_j+A^i{}_j]\right)^{-1/2}-I\right]\right\}. \tag{3.106}$$

4. A particular realization of the last case is when the matrices Γ^i satisfy the Dirac-type condition

$$\Gamma^i\Gamma^j+\Gamma^j\Gamma^i=2\,\hat{g}^{ij}\frac{1}{(m-1)}\Gamma^2, \tag{3.107}$$

   so that

$$A^{ij}=\Gamma^{(i}\Gamma^{j)}=\frac{1}{(m-1)}\hat{g}^{ij}\Gamma^2. \tag{3.108}$$

   Then, of course, the matrices A^{ij} commute and the result is given by eq. (3.106). But the determinant is now

$$\det{}_{T\partial M}[\delta^i{}_j+A^i{}_j]=\left(I+\frac{1}{(m-1)}\Gamma^2\right)^{m-1}. \tag{3.109}$$

Thus,

$$a_{1/2} = \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2}\left\{I - 2\Pi + 2\left[\left(I + \frac{1}{(m-1)}\Gamma^2\right)^{-(m-1)/2} - I\right]\right\}. \tag{3.110}$$

Note that this *differs essentially* from the result of ref. [3], and shows again that the result of ref. [3] applies actually only to the completely Abelian case, when all matrices Γ^j commute. Note also that, in the most interesting applications (e.g. in quantum gravity), the matrices Γ^i do not commute [12]. The result (3.94), however, is valid in the most general case.

5. A very important case is when the operator Λ is a natural operator on the boundary. Since it is of first order it can be only the generalized Dirac operator. In this case the matrices Γ^j satisfy the condition

$$\Gamma^i\Gamma^j + \Gamma^j\Gamma^i \equiv 2A^{ij} = -2\,\kappa\hat{g}^{ij}(I - \Pi), \tag{3.111}$$

where κ is a constant. Hence the matrices A^{ij} obviously commute and we have the case considered above (see (3.106)). The determinant is easily calculated,

$$\det{}_{T\partial M}[\delta^i_j + A^i_j] = \Pi + (I - \Pi)(1-\kappa)^{m-1}, \tag{3.112}$$

and we eventually obtain

$$a_{1/2} = \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2}\left\{-\Pi + (I - \Pi)\left[2(1-\kappa)^{-(m-1)/2} - 1\right]\right\}. \tag{3.113}$$

Thus, a singularity is found at $\kappa = 1$. This happens because, for $\kappa = 1$, the strong ellipticity condition is violated (see also [11]). Indeed, the strong ellipticity condition (2.81),

$$T^2 + |\zeta|^2 I = (\Gamma\cdot\zeta)^2 + |\zeta|^2 I = |\zeta|^2[\Pi + (1-\kappa)(I - \Pi)] > 0, \tag{3.114}$$

implies in this case $\kappa < 1$ (cf. [11]).

4 Analysis of ellipticity in a general gauge theory on manifolds with boundary

In this section we are going to study gauge-invariant boundary conditions in a general gauge theory (for a review, see [22]). A gauge theory is defined by two vector bundles, V and G, such that $\dim V > \dim G$. V is the bundle of gauge fields $\varphi \in C^\infty(V, M)$, and G is the bundle of parameters of gauge transformations $\epsilon \in C^\infty(G, M)$. Both bundles V and G are equipped with some Hermitian positive-definite metrics E, $E^\dagger = E$, and γ, $\gamma^\dagger = \gamma$, and with the corresponding natural L^2 scalar products $(,)_V$ and $(,)_G$.

The infinitesimal gauge transformations

$$\delta\varphi = R\epsilon \tag{4.1}$$

are determined by a first-order differential operator R,

$$R: \ C^{\infty}(G, M) \rightarrow C^{\infty}(V, M). \tag{4.2}$$

Further, one introduces two auxiliary operators,

$$X: \ C^{\infty}(V, M) \rightarrow C^{\infty}(G, M) \tag{4.3}$$

and

$$Y: \ C^{\infty}(G, M) \rightarrow C^{\infty}(G, M), \tag{4.4}$$

and one defines two differential operators,

$$L \equiv XR: \ C^{\infty}(G, M) \rightarrow C^{\infty}(G, M) \tag{4.5}$$

and

$$H \equiv \bar{X}YX: \ C^{\infty}(V, M) \rightarrow C^{\infty}(V, M), \tag{4.6}$$

where $\bar{X} = E^{-1}X^{\dagger}\gamma$. The operators X and Y should satisfy the following conditions (but are otherwise arbitrary):

1) The differential operators L and H have the same order.
2) The operators L and H are formally self-adjoint (or anti-self-adjoint).
3) The operators L and Y are elliptic.

From these conditions we find that there are two essentially different cases:

Case I. X is of first order and Y is of zeroth order, i.e.

$$X = \bar{R}, \qquad Y = I_G, \tag{4.7}$$

where $\bar{R} \equiv \gamma^{-1}R^{\dagger}E$. Then, of course, L and H are both *second-order* differential operators,

$$L = \bar{R}R, \qquad H = R\bar{R}. \tag{4.8}$$

Case II. X is of zeroth order and Y is of first order. Let $\mathcal{R}$ be the bundle of maps of G into V, and let $\beta \in \mathcal{R}$ be a zeroth-order differential operator. Then

$$X = \bar{\beta}, \qquad Y = \bar{\beta}R, \tag{4.9}$$

where $\bar{\beta} \equiv \gamma^{-1}\beta^{\dagger}E$, and the operators L and H are of *first* order,

$$L = \bar{\beta}R, \qquad H = \beta\bar{\beta}R\bar{\beta} = \beta L\bar{\beta}. \tag{4.10}$$

We assume that, by suitable choice of the parameters, the second-order operator $\bar{R}R$ can be made of Laplace type and the first-order operator $\bar{\beta}R$ can be made of Dirac type, and, therefore, have non-degenerate leading symbols,

$$\det{}_G \sigma_L(\bar{R}R) \neq 0, \tag{4.11}$$

$$\det{}_G \sigma_L(\bar{\beta}R) \neq 0. \tag{4.12}$$

The dynamics of gauge fields $\varphi \in C^\infty(V, M)$ at the linearized (one-loop) level is described by a formally self-adjoint (or anti-self-adjoint) differential operator,

$$\Delta : \; C^\infty(V, M) \to C^\infty(V, M). \tag{4.13}$$

This operator is of second order for bosonic fields and of first order for fermionic fields. In both cases it satisfies the identities

$$\Delta R = 0, \qquad \bar{R}\Delta = 0, \tag{4.14}$$

and, therefore, is degenerate.

We consider only the case when the gauge generators are *linearly independent*. This means that the equation

$$\sigma_L(R)\epsilon = 0, \tag{4.15}$$

for $\xi \neq 0$, has *the only* solution $\epsilon = 0$. In other words,

$$\mathrm{Ker}\, \sigma_L(R) = \emptyset, \tag{4.16}$$

i.e. the rank of the leading symbol of the operator R equals the dimension of the bundle G,

$$\mathrm{rank}\, \sigma_L(R) = \dim G. \tag{4.17}$$

We also assume that the leading symbols of the generators R are *complete* in that they generate *all* zero-modes of the leading symbol of the operator Δ, i.e. *all* solutions of the equation

$$\sigma_L(\Delta)\varphi = 0, \tag{4.18}$$

for $\xi \neq 0$, have the form

$$\varphi = \sigma_L(R)\epsilon, \tag{4.19}$$

for some ϵ. In other words,

$$\mathrm{Ker}\, \sigma_L(\Delta) = \{\sigma_L(R)\epsilon \mid \epsilon \in G\}, \tag{4.20}$$

and hence

$$\mathrm{rank}\, \sigma_L(\Delta) = \dim V - \dim G. \tag{4.21}$$

Further, let us take the operator H of the *same* order as the operator Δ and construct a formally (anti-)self-adjoint operator,

$$F \equiv \Delta + H, \tag{4.22}$$

so that

$$\sigma_L(F) = \sigma_L(\Delta) + \sigma_L(H). \tag{4.23}$$

It is easy to derive the following result:

Proposition 1 *The leading symbol of the operator F is non-degenerate, i.e.*

$$\det{}_V \sigma_L(F; x, \xi) \neq 0, \tag{4.24}$$

for any $\xi \neq 0$.

Proof. Indeed, suppose there exists a zero-mode, say φ_0, of the leading symbol of the operator F, i.e.

$$\sigma_L(F)\varphi_0 = \bar{\varphi}_0\sigma_L(F) = 0, \tag{4.25}$$

where $\bar{\varphi} \equiv \varphi^\dagger E$. Then we have

$$\bar{\varphi}_0\sigma_L(F)\sigma_L(R) = \bar{\varphi}_0\sigma_L(\bar{X}Y)\sigma_L(L) = 0, \tag{4.26}$$

and, since $\sigma_L(L)$ is non-degenerate,

$$\bar{\varphi}_0\sigma_L(\bar{X}Y) = \sigma_L(YX)\varphi_0 = 0. \tag{4.27}$$

But this implies

$$\sigma_L(H)\varphi_0 = 0, \tag{4.28}$$

and hence

$$\sigma_L(F)\varphi_0 = \sigma_L(\Delta)\varphi_0 = 0. \tag{4.29}$$

Thus, φ_0 is a zero-mode of the leading symbol of the operator Δ, and according to the completeness of the generators R must have the form $\varphi_0 = \sigma_L(R)\epsilon$ for some ϵ. Substituting this form into the eq. (4.27) we obtain

$$\sigma_L(YX)\sigma_L(R)\epsilon = \sigma_L(YL)\epsilon = 0. \tag{4.30}$$

Herefrom, by taking into account the non-singularity of $\sigma_L(YL)$, it follows $\epsilon = \varphi_0 = 0$, and hence the leading symbol of the operator F does not have any zero-modes, i.e. it is non-degenerate.

Thus, the operators L and F have, both, non-degenerate leading symbols. In quantum field theory the operator X is called the gauge-fixing operator, F the gauge-field operator, the operator L the (Faddeev-Popov) ghost operator and the operator Y in the Case II the third (or Nielsen-Kallosh) ghost operator. The most convenient and the most important case is when, by suitable choice of the parameters it turns out to be possible to make both the operators F and L either of Laplace type or of Dirac type. The one-loop effective action for gauge fields is given by the functional superdeterminants of the gauge-field operator F and the ghost operators L and Y [22]

$$\Gamma = \frac{1}{2}\log\left(\mathrm{Sdet}\, F\right) - \log\left(\mathrm{Sdet}\, L\right) - \frac{1}{2}\log\left(\mathrm{Sdet}\, Y\right). \tag{4.31}$$

4.1 Bosonic gauge fields

Let us consider first the case of bosonic fields, when Δ is a second-order formally self-adjoint operator. The gauge invariance identity (4.14) means, in particular,

$$\sigma_L(\Delta)\sigma_L(R) = 0. \tag{4.32}$$

Now we assume that both the operators $L = \bar{R}R$ and $F = \Delta + R\bar{R}$ are of Laplace type, i.e.

$$\sigma_L(\bar{R}R) = |\xi|^2 I_G, \tag{4.33}$$

$$\sigma_L(F) = \sigma_L(\Delta) + \sigma_L(R\bar{R}) = |\xi|^2 I. \tag{4.34}$$

On manifolds with boundary one has to impose some boundary conditions to make these operators self-adjoint and elliptic. They read

$$B_L \psi(\epsilon) = 0, \tag{4.35}$$

$$B_F \psi(\varphi) = 0, \tag{4.36}$$

where $\psi(\epsilon)$ and $\psi(\varphi)$ are the boundary data for the bundles G and V, respectively, and B_L and B_F are the corresponding boundary operators (see section 2.1). In gauge theories one tries to choose the boundary operators B_L and B_F in a gauge-invariant way, so that the condition

$$B_F \psi(R\epsilon) = 0 \tag{4.37}$$

is satisfied identically for any ϵ subject to the boundary conditions (4.35). This means that the boundary operators B_L and B_F satisfy the identity

$$B_F [\psi, R](I - B_L) \equiv 0, \tag{4.38}$$

where $[\psi, R]$ is the commutator of the linear boundary data map ψ and the operator R.

We will see that this requirement fixes completely the form of the as yet unknown boundary operator B_L. Indeed, the most natural way to satisfy the condition of gauge invariance is as follows. Let us decompose the cotangent bundle T^*M in such a way that $\xi = (N, \zeta) \in T^*M$, where N is the inward pointing unit normal to the boundary and $\zeta \in T^*\partial M$ is a cotangent vector on the boundary. Consider the restriction W_0 of the vector bundle V to the boundary. Let us define restrictions of the leading symbols of the operators R and Δ to the boundary, i.e.

$$\Pi \equiv \sigma_L(\Delta; N)\Big|_{\partial M}, \tag{4.39}$$

$$\nu \equiv \sigma_L(R; N)\Big|_{\partial M}, \tag{4.40}$$

$$\mu \equiv \sigma_L(R; \zeta)\Big|_{\partial M}. \tag{4.41}$$

From eq. (4.32) we have thus the identity

$$\Pi \nu = 0, \tag{4.42}$$

Moreover, from (4.33) and (4.34) we have also

$$\bar{\nu}\nu = I_G, \tag{4.43}$$

$$\bar{\nu}\mu + \bar{\mu}\nu = 0, \tag{4.44}$$

$$\bar{\mu}\mu = |\zeta|^2 I_G, \tag{4.45}$$

$$\Pi = I - \nu\bar{\nu}. \tag{4.46}$$

From (4.42) and (4.43) we find that $\Pi: \ W_0 \rightarrow W_0$ is a self-adjoint projector orthogonal to ν,

$$\Pi^2 = \Pi, \qquad \Pi\nu = 0, \qquad \bar{\Pi} = \Pi. \tag{4.47}$$

Then, a part of the boundary conditions for the operator F reads

$$\Pi\varphi\Big|_{\partial M} = 0. \tag{4.48}$$

The gauge transformation of this equation is

$$\Pi R\epsilon\Big|_{\partial M} = 0. \tag{4.49}$$

The normal derivative does not contribute to this equation, and, therefore, if Dirichlet boundary conditions are imposed on ϵ,

$$\epsilon\Big|_{\partial M} = 0, \tag{4.50}$$

the equation (4.49) is satisfied identically.

The easiest way to get the other part of the boundary conditions is just to set

$$\bar{R}\varphi\Big|_{\partial M} = 0. \tag{4.51}$$

Bearing in mind eq. (4.5) we find that, under the gauge transformations (4.1), this is transformed into

$$L\epsilon\Big|_{\partial M} = 0. \tag{4.52}$$

If some ϵ is a zero-mode of the operator L, i.e. $\epsilon \in \mathrm{Ker}\,(L)$, this is identically zero. For all $\epsilon \notin \mathrm{Ker}\,(L)$ this is identically zero for the Dirichlet boundary conditions (4.50). In other words, the requirement of gauge invariance of the boundary conditions (4.36) determines in an almost unique way (up to zero-modes) that the ghost boundary operator B_L should be of Dirichlet type. Anyway, the Dirichlet boundary conditions for the operator L are *sufficient* to achieve gauge invariance of the boundary conditions for the operator F.

Since the operator $\bar{R}$ in the boundary conditions (4.51) is a first-order operator, the set of boundary conditions (4.48) and (4.51) is equivalent to the general scheme formulated in section 2.1. Separating the normal derivative in the operator $\bar{R}$ we find exactly the generalized boundary conditions (2.15) with the boundary operator B_F of the form (2.25) with a first-order operator $\Lambda : C^\infty(W_0, \partial M) \rightarrow C^\infty(W_0, \partial M)$, the matrices Γ^j being of the form

$$\Gamma^j = -\nu\bar{\nu}\mu^j\bar{\nu}. \tag{4.53}$$

These matrices are anti-self-adjoint, $\bar{\Gamma}^i = -\Gamma^i$, and satisfy the relations

$$\Pi\Gamma^i = \Gamma^i\Pi = 0. \tag{4.54}$$

Thus, one can now define the matrix

$$T \equiv \Gamma\cdot\zeta = -\nu\bar{\nu}\mu\bar{\nu}, \tag{4.55}$$

where $\mu \equiv \mu^j \zeta_j$, and study the condition of strong ellipticity (2.80). The condition of strong ellipticity now reads

$$|\zeta| I - iT = |\zeta| I + i\nu\bar{\nu}\mu\bar{\nu} > 0. \tag{4.56}$$

Further, using the eqs. (4.53), (4.44) and (4.45) we evaluate

$$A^{ij} = \Gamma^{(i}\Gamma^{j)} = -(I-\Pi)\mu^{(i}\bar{\mu}^{j)}(I-\Pi). \tag{4.57}$$

Therefore,

$$T^2 = A^{ij}\zeta_i\zeta_j = -(I-\Pi)\mu\bar{\mu}(I-\Pi), \tag{4.58}$$

and

$$T^2 + |\zeta|^2 I = |\zeta|^2 \Pi + (I-\Pi)[|\zeta|^2 I - \mu\bar{\mu}](I-\Pi). \tag{4.59}$$

Since for non-vanishing ζ the part proportional to Π is positive-definite, the condition of strong ellipticity for bosonic gauge theory means

$$(I-\Pi)[|\zeta|^2 I - \mu\bar{\mu}](I-\Pi) > 0. \tag{4.60}$$

We have thus proved a theorem:

Theorem 5 *Let V and G be two vector bundles over a compact Riemannian manifold M with smooth boundary, such that $\dim V > \dim G$. Consider a bosonic gauge theory and let the first-order differential operator $R: C^\infty(G,M) \to C^\infty(V,M)$ be the generator of infinitesimal gauge transformations. Let $\Delta : C^\infty(V,M) \to C^\infty(V,M)$ be the gauge-invariant second-order differential operator of the linearized field equations. Let the operators $L \equiv \bar{R}R : C^\infty(G,M) \to C^\infty(G,M)$ and $F \equiv \Delta + R\bar{R}$ be of Laplace type and normalized by $\sigma_L(L) = |\xi|^2 I_G$. Let $\sigma_L(R;N)\big|_{\partial M} \equiv \nu$ and $\sigma_L(R;\zeta)\big|_{\partial M} \equiv \mu$ be the restriction of the leading symbol of the operator R to the boundary, N being the normal to the boundary and $\zeta \in T^*\partial M$ being a cotangent vector, and $\Pi = I - \nu\bar{\nu}$.*

Then the generalized boundary-value problem (F, B_F) with the boundary operator B_F determined by the boundary conditions (4.48) and (4.51) is gauge-invariant provided that the ghost boundary operator B_L takes the Dirichlet form. Moreover, it is strongly elliptic with respect to $\mathbf{C} - \mathbf{R}_+$ if and only if the matrix $[|\zeta| I + i\nu\bar{\nu}\mu\bar{\nu}]$ is positive-definite. A sufficient condition for that reads

$$(I-\Pi)[|\zeta|^2 I - \mu\bar{\mu}](I-\Pi) > 0. \tag{4.61}$$

4.2 Fermionic gauge fields

In the case of fermionic gauge fields, Δ is a first-order formally self-adjoint (or anti-self-adjoint), degenerate (i.e. gauge-invariant) operator with leading symbol satisfying

$$\sigma_L(\Delta)\sigma_L(R) = 0. \tag{4.62}$$

Now we have the case II, hence, we assume both the operators $L = \bar{\beta}R$ and $F = \Delta + \beta\bar{\beta}R\bar{\beta}$ to be of Dirac type, i.e. the operators L^2 and F^2 are of Laplace type:

$$[\bar{\beta}\sigma_L(R)]^2 = |\xi|^2 I_G, \tag{4.63}$$

$$\Big[\sigma_L(\Delta)+\beta\bar\beta\sigma_L(R)\bar\beta\Big]^2=|\xi|^2 I. \tag{4.64}$$

Note that now we have *two* systems of Dirac matrices, γ^μ on the bundle G and Γ^μ on V. They are defined by the leading symbols of the Dirac-type operators L and F,

$$\sigma_L(L)=-\gamma^\mu\xi_\mu, \qquad \sigma_L(F)=-\Gamma^\mu\xi_\mu. \tag{4.65}$$

Let us define

$$b\equiv\sigma_L(\Delta;N)\Big|_{\partial M}, \qquad c\equiv\sigma_L(\Delta;\zeta)\Big|_{\partial M}, \tag{4.66}$$

where $\zeta\in T^*\partial M$. Bearing in mind the notation (4.40) and (4.41), we have from (4.62)

$$b\nu=0, \qquad c\nu+b\mu=0. \tag{4.67}$$

Moreover, from (4.63) we have also

$$\bar\beta\nu\bar\beta\nu=I_G, \tag{4.68}$$

$$\bar\beta\nu\bar\beta\mu+\bar\beta\mu\bar\beta\nu=0. \tag{4.69}$$

Similarly, from (4.64) we get

$$\Big(b+\beta\bar\beta\nu\bar\beta\Big)^2=I, \tag{4.70}$$

$$\Big(b+\beta\bar\beta\nu\bar\beta\Big)\Big(c+\beta\bar\beta\mu\bar\beta\Big)+\Big(c+\beta\bar\beta\mu\bar\beta\Big)\Big(b+\beta\bar\beta\nu\bar\beta\Big)=0. \tag{4.71}$$

Herefrom, we find that the following operators:

$$P_G=\frac{1}{2}[I_G-\gamma(N)]=\frac{1}{2}(I_G+\bar\beta\nu), \tag{4.72}$$

$$P_V=\frac{1}{2}[I-\Gamma(N)]=\frac{1}{2}(I+b+\beta\bar\beta\nu\bar\beta), \tag{4.73}$$

are projectors,

$$P_G^2=P_G, \qquad P_V^2=P_V. \tag{4.74}$$

The boundary conditions for the Dirac-type operators L and F are given by projectors (see (2.31)),

$$P_L\epsilon\Big|_{\partial M}=0, \tag{4.75}$$

$$P_F\varphi\Big|_{\partial M}=0. \tag{4.76}$$

The problem is to make them gauge-invariant. Here the projectors P_L and P_F are defined by means of the matrices γ^μ and Γ^μ, respectively. The gauge transformation of the equation (4.76) is

$$P_F R\epsilon\Big|_{\partial M}=0. \tag{4.77}$$

Noting that, on the boundary,

$$R\epsilon\Big|_{\partial M}=[\nu\bar\beta\nu L-i(I-\nu\bar\beta\nu\bar\beta)\mu^j\hat\nabla_j]\epsilon\Big|_{\partial M}, \tag{4.78}$$

and assuming that μ commutes with P_L, we get herefrom two conditions on the boundary projectors,

$$P_F\nu\bar\beta\nu(I_G-P_L)=0, \tag{4.79}$$

$$P_F(I-\nu\bar\beta\nu\bar\beta)(I_G-P_L)=0. \tag{4.80}$$

Such gauge-invariant boundary operators always exist. We will construct them explicitly in section 6 in the course of studying the Rarita–Schwinger system.

5 Strong ellipticity in Yang–Mills theory

The first physical application that we study is the strong ellipticity condition in Yang–Mills theory. Now $G = A$ is the Lie algebra of a semi-simple and compact gauge group, and V is the bundle of 1-forms taking values in A, i.e. $V = T^*M \otimes G$. Let h be the Cartan metric on the Lie algebra defined by

$$h_{ab} \equiv -C^c{}_{ad}C^d{}_{cb}, \tag{5.1}$$

$C^a{}_{bc}$ being the structure constants of the gauge group, and the fibre metric E on the bundle V be defined by

$$E(\varphi, \varphi) \equiv -\mathrm{tr}\,_A g(\varphi, \varphi), \tag{5.2}$$

or, in components,

$$E^\mu{}_a{}^\nu{}_b = g^{\mu\nu} h_{ab}. \tag{5.3}$$

The Cartan metric is non-degenerate and positive-definite. Therefore, the fibre metric E is always non-singular and positive-definite. Henceforth we will suppress the group indices. The generator of gauge transformations is now just the covariant derivative

$$R = \nabla^G, \qquad \bar{R} = -\mathrm{tr}\,_g \nabla^V. \tag{5.4}$$

The leading symbols of these operators are

$$\sigma_L(R; \xi) = i\xi I_G, \qquad \sigma_L(\bar{R}; \xi) = -i\bar{\xi} I, \tag{5.5}$$

where $\bar{\xi} \equiv \mathrm{tr}\,_g \xi$ is a map $\bar{\xi} : T^*M \to \mathbf{R}$. First of all, we see that

$$\sigma_L(L; \xi) = \sigma_L(\bar{R}R; \xi) = \bar{\xi}\xi I_G = |\xi|^2 I_G, \tag{5.6}$$

$$\sigma_L(H; \xi) = \sigma_L(R\bar{R}; \xi) = \xi \otimes \bar{\xi} I, \tag{5.7}$$

so that the operator $L = \bar{R}R$ is indeed a Laplace-type operator. The gauge-invariant operator Δ in linearized Yang–Mills theory is defined by the leading symbol

$$\sigma_L(\Delta) = \left(|\xi|^2 - \xi \otimes \bar{\xi}\right) I. \tag{5.8}$$

Thus, the operator $F = \Delta + H$ is of Laplace type,

$$\sigma_L(F) = \sigma_L(\Delta + H) = |\xi|^2 I. \tag{5.9}$$

Further, we find

$$\nu = i\, N I_G, \qquad \bar{\nu} = -i\, \mathrm{tr}\,_g N, \tag{5.10}$$

and

$$\mu = i\, \zeta I_G, \qquad \bar{\mu} = -i\, \mathrm{tr}\,_g \bar{\zeta}, \tag{5.11}$$

where N is the normal cotangent vector, and $\zeta \in T^*\partial M$.

The projector Π has the form

$$\Pi = q, \tag{5.12}$$

where

$$q \equiv 1 - N \otimes \bar{N}. \tag{5.13}$$

In components, this reads

$$q_\mu{}^\nu \equiv \delta^\nu_\mu - N_\mu N^\nu. \tag{5.14}$$

Thus, the gauge-invariant boundary conditions are

$$q_\mu{}^\nu \varphi_\nu \Big|_{\partial M} = 0, \tag{5.15}$$

$$g^{\mu\nu} \nabla_\mu \varphi_\nu \Big|_{\partial M} = 0. \tag{5.16}$$

Since $\bar{\zeta} N = \bar{N} \zeta =< \zeta, N >= 0$, we find from (5.10) and (5.11)

$$\bar{\mu}\nu = \bar{\nu}\mu = 0, \tag{5.17}$$

and hence the matrices Γ^i in (2.57), as well as $T = \Gamma^i \zeta_i$, vanish:

$$\Gamma^j = 0, \quad T = 0. \tag{5.18}$$

Therefore, the matrix $T^2 + \zeta^2 I = |\zeta|^2 I$ is positive-definite, so that the strong ellipticity condition (2.80) or (4.61) is satisfied.

Thus, we have

Theorem 6 *A Laplace-type operator F acting on 1-forms taking values in a semi-simple Lie algebra G, $F: \ C^\infty(T^*M \otimes G, M) \rightarrow C^\infty(T^*M \otimes G, M)$, with the boundary conditions (5.15) and (5.16), is elliptic.*

Since such boundary conditions automatically appear in the gauge-invariant formulation of the boundary conditions in one-loop Yang–Mills theory, we have herefrom

Corollary 1 *The boundary-value problem in one-loop Euclidean Yang–Mills theory determined by a Laplace-type operator and the gauge-invariant boundary conditions defined by (5.15) and (5.16), is strongly elliptic with respect to $\mathbf{C} - \mathbf{R}_+$.*

6 Ellipticity for the Rarita–Schwinger system

The next step is the analysis of Rarita–Schwinger fields. The bundle G is now the bundle of spinor fields taking values in some semi-simple Lie algebra A, i.e. $G = \mathcal{S} \otimes A$, and V is the bundle of spin-vector fields, in other words, V is the bundle of 1-forms taking values in the fibre of G, i.e. $V = T^*M \otimes G$. The whole theory does not depend on the presence of the algebra A, so we will omit completely the group indices.

Let γ^μ be the Dirac matrices and γ be the Hermitian metric on the spinor bundle $\mathcal{S}$ determined by

$$\gamma^\mu \gamma^\nu + \gamma^\nu \gamma^\mu = 2 g^{\mu\nu} I_S, \qquad \bar{\gamma}^\mu = -\varepsilon \gamma^\mu, \qquad \gamma^\dagger = \gamma, \tag{6.1}$$

where $\bar{\gamma}^\mu = \gamma^{-1}\gamma^{\mu\dagger}\gamma$. The fibre metric E on the bundle V is defined by

$$E(\varphi, \varphi) \equiv \varphi^\dagger_\mu \gamma E^{\mu\nu} \varphi_\nu, \tag{6.2}$$

where

$$E^{\mu\nu} \equiv g^{\mu\nu} + \alpha \gamma^\mu \gamma^\nu, \tag{6.3}$$

with a parameter α. By using (6.1) it is easily seen that E is Hermitian, i.e.

$$\bar{E}^{\mu\nu} = E^{\nu\mu}, \tag{6.4}$$

if α is real. The inverse metric reads

$$E^{-1}_{\mu\nu} = g_{\mu\nu} - \frac{\alpha}{(1+m\alpha)} \gamma_\mu \gamma_\nu. \tag{6.5}$$

Therefore, the fibre metric E is positive-definite only for $\alpha > -1/m$ and is singular for $\alpha = -1/m$. Thus, hereafter $\alpha \neq -1/m$. In fact, for $\alpha = -1/m$ the matrix $E_\mu{}^\nu$ becomes a projector on a subspace of spin-vectors φ_μ satisfying the condition $\gamma^\mu \varphi_\mu = 0$.

The generator of gauge transformations is now again, as in the Yang–Mills case, just the covariant derivative [23]

$$R = b\nabla^G, \tag{6.6}$$

where b is a normalization constant, with leading symbol

$$\sigma_L(R; \xi) = ib\xi I_G. \tag{6.7}$$

Now we have the Case II of section 4, and hence we define the map $\beta : \ G \to V$ and its adjoint $\bar{\beta} : \ V \to G$ by

$$(\beta\epsilon)_\mu \equiv \frac{i\varepsilon}{b} E^{-1}_{\mu\nu} \gamma^\nu \epsilon = \frac{i\varepsilon}{b(1+\alpha m)} \gamma_\mu \epsilon, \qquad \bar{\beta}\varphi \equiv \frac{i}{b} \gamma^\mu \varphi_\mu, \tag{6.8}$$

so that

$$\bar{\beta}\beta = \frac{-\varepsilon m}{b^2(1+\alpha m)} I_G. \tag{6.9}$$

The operator X of Eq. (4.3) is now equal to $\bar{\beta}$ so that the operator $L = \bar{\beta}R$ is of Dirac type with leading symbol

$$\sigma_L(L) = -\gamma^\mu \xi_\mu. \tag{6.10}$$

The leading symbol of the operator $H = \beta\bar{\beta}R\bar{\beta}$ reads

$$\sigma_L(H)\varphi_\lambda = \frac{\varepsilon}{b^2(1+\alpha m)} \gamma_\lambda \gamma^\mu \gamma^\nu \xi_\mu \varphi_\nu. \tag{6.11}$$

The gauge-invariant operator Δ is now the Rarita–Schwinger operator with leading symbol

$$\sigma_L(\Delta)\varphi_\lambda = \varepsilon E^{-1}_{\lambda\beta} \gamma^{\mu\beta\nu} \xi_\mu \varphi_\nu. \tag{6.12}$$

Here and below we denote the antisymmetrized products of γ-matrices by

$$\gamma^{\mu_1 \cdots \mu_n} \equiv \gamma^{[\mu_1} \cdots \gamma^{\mu_n]}. \tag{6.13}$$

Of course, the leading symbol is self-adjoint and gauge-invariant, in that

$$\overline{\sigma_L(\Delta)} = \sigma_L(\Delta), \qquad \sigma_L(\Delta)\sigma_L(R) = 0, \tag{6.14}$$

where $\overline{\sigma_L(\Delta)} = E^{-1}\sigma_L^{\dagger}(\Delta)E$. Further, the leading symbol of the operator $F = \Delta + H$ reads

$$\sigma_L(F)\varphi_\lambda = \varepsilon \left[E^{-1}_{\lambda\beta}\gamma^{\mu\beta\nu} + \frac{1}{b^2(1+\alpha m)}\gamma_\lambda\gamma^\mu\gamma^\nu \right] \xi_\mu\varphi_\nu. \tag{6.15}$$

Using the properties of the Clifford algebra we compute

$$\sigma_L(F)\varphi_\lambda = -\varepsilon \left\{ \delta^\nu_\lambda\gamma^\mu - \delta^\mu_\lambda\gamma^\nu + \frac{1}{(1+m\alpha)}\left(1 + 2\alpha - \frac{1}{b^2}\right)\gamma_\lambda\gamma^\mu\gamma^\nu - \frac{(1+2\alpha)}{(1+m\alpha)}\gamma_\lambda g^{\mu\nu} \right\} \xi_\mu\varphi_\nu. \tag{6.16}$$

Moreover, one can prove the following property of representation theory:

Proposition 2 *The matrices* $\widetilde{\Gamma}^\mu(0)$ *defined by*

$$(\widetilde{\Gamma}^\mu(0))_\lambda{}^\nu = \widetilde{\Gamma}^\mu{}_\lambda{}^\nu(0) \equiv \delta^\nu_\lambda\gamma^\mu + \frac{2}{m}\gamma_\lambda\gamma^\mu\gamma^\nu + (\omega - 1)\delta^\mu_\lambda\gamma^\nu - (\omega + 1)\gamma_\lambda g^{\mu\nu}, \tag{6.17}$$

where ω *is defined by*

$$\omega^2 \equiv \frac{m-4}{m}, \tag{6.18}$$

form a representation of the Clifford algebra, i.e.

$$\widetilde{\Gamma}^\mu{}_\beta{}^\lambda(0)\widetilde{\Gamma}^\nu{}_\lambda{}^\rho(0) + \widetilde{\Gamma}^\nu{}_\beta{}^\lambda(0)\widetilde{\Gamma}^\mu{}_\lambda{}^\rho(0) = 2g^{\mu\nu}\delta^\rho_\beta I_{\mathcal{S}}. \tag{6.19}$$

It is thus clear that the set of matrices

$$\widetilde{\Gamma}^\mu{}_\lambda{}^\beta(\alpha') = T^{-1}{}_\lambda{}^\rho(\alpha')\widetilde{\Gamma}^\mu{}_\rho{}^\sigma(0)T_\sigma{}^\beta(\alpha'), \tag{6.20}$$

with arbitrary non-degenerate matrix $T(\alpha')$ depending on a parameter α', also forms a representation of the Clifford algebra. By choosing

$$T_\lambda{}^\beta(\alpha') = \delta^\beta_\lambda + \alpha'\gamma_\lambda\gamma^\beta, \tag{6.21}$$

and, hence,

$$T^{-1}{}_\lambda{}^\beta(\alpha') = \delta^\beta_\lambda - \frac{\alpha'}{(1+m\alpha')}\gamma_\lambda\gamma^\beta, \tag{6.22}$$

we prove, more generally, what follows.

Corollary 2 *The matrices* $\widetilde{\Gamma}^\mu(\alpha')$ *defined by*

$$(\widetilde{\Gamma}^\mu(\alpha'))_\lambda{}^\nu = \widetilde{\Gamma}^\mu{}_\lambda{}^\nu(\alpha') \equiv \delta^\nu_\lambda\gamma^\mu + c_1\gamma_\lambda\gamma^\mu\gamma^\nu + c_2\delta^\mu_\lambda\gamma^\nu + c_3\gamma_\lambda g^{\mu\nu}, \tag{6.23}$$

where

$$c_1 \equiv \frac{(m - 2 - m\omega)}{(1+m\alpha')}\left(\alpha' + \frac{\omega+1}{2}\right)^2, \tag{6.24}$$

$$c_2 \equiv -(m-2-m\omega)\left(\alpha' + \frac{\omega+1}{2}\right), \tag{6.25}$$

$$c_3 \equiv -\frac{2}{(1+m\alpha')}\left(\alpha' + \frac{\omega+1}{2}\right), \tag{6.26}$$

with α' an arbitrary constant $\alpha' \neq -1/m$, and ω defined by (6.18), form a representation of the Clifford algebra, i.e. satisfy the eq. (6.19).

Note that, by choosing $\alpha' = -(\omega+1)/2$, all the constants c_1, c_2 and c_3 vanish.

The operator F with leading symbol (6.16) should be of Dirac type. Thus, by imposing that the term in curly brackets in Eq. (6.16) should coincide with the right-hand side of Eq. (6.23), one finds a system whose solution is

$$\alpha' = \frac{1}{4}\left[m-4+(m-2)\omega\right], \tag{6.27}$$

$$\alpha = \frac{m-4}{4}, \tag{6.28}$$

$$b = \pm\frac{2}{\sqrt{m-2}}. \tag{6.29}$$

The simplest case is $m=4$, one has then $\alpha = \alpha' = 0$, $b = \pm\sqrt{2}$.

After this choice the operator F is of Dirac type, i.e. $\sigma_L(F) = -\varepsilon\Gamma^\mu\xi_\mu$, with

$$(\Gamma^\mu)_\lambda{}^\nu = \Gamma^\mu{}_\lambda{}^\nu \equiv \delta^\nu_\lambda\gamma^\mu + \frac{1}{(m-2)}\gamma_\lambda\gamma^\mu\gamma^\nu - \delta^\mu_\lambda\gamma^\nu - \frac{2}{(m-2)}\gamma_\lambda g^{\mu\nu}. \tag{6.30}$$

Thus, we have two Dirac-type operators, L and F, which have elliptic leading symbols. By choosing the appropriate boundary conditions with the projectors P_L and P_F the system becomes elliptic. The problem is to define the boundary projectors in a gauge-invariant way.

Let P_L the boundary projector for the ghost operator L,

$$P_L\epsilon\Big|_{\partial M} = 0. \tag{6.31}$$

Remember that it satisfies the symmetry condition (2.44). Then we choose the boundary conditions for the gauge field in the form

$$P_L q_\nu{}^\mu\varphi_\mu\Big|_{\partial M} = 0, \tag{6.32}$$

$$P_L\gamma^\mu\varphi_\mu\Big|_{\partial M} = 0, \tag{6.33}$$

where q is a projector defined by (5.13). The gauge transformation of (6.32) reads

$$P_L q_\nu{}^\mu\nabla_\mu\epsilon\Big|_{\partial M} = 0, \tag{6.34}$$

and does not include the normal derivative. We are assuming that the projector P_L commutes with the tangential derivative (as is usually the case, we find that their commutator vanishes identically by virtue of the boundary conditions on ϵ). The gauge transformation of eq. (6.33) is proportional exactly to the operator L,

$$P_L \bar{\beta} R \epsilon \Big|_{\partial M} = P_L L \epsilon \Big|_{\partial M} = 0. \tag{6.35}$$

By expanding ϵ in the eigenmodes of the operator L we find that this is proportional to the boundary conditions (6.31) on ϵ, and therefore vanishes. Thus, the boundary conditions (6.32) and (6.33) are gauge-invariant. They can be re-written in another convenient form,

$$P_L [q_\nu{}^\mu + N_\nu \gamma^\mu] \varphi_\mu \Big|_{\partial M} = 0. \tag{6.36}$$

This defines eventually the boundary projector P_F for the gauge operator F,

$$P_F{}_\mu{}^\beta = [\delta_\mu{}^\nu - N_\mu N_\alpha \gamma^\alpha N^\nu - N_\mu N_\alpha \gamma^\alpha \gamma^\nu] P_L [q_\nu{}^\beta + N_\nu \gamma^\beta]. \tag{6.37}$$

If the projector P_L satisfies the symmetry condition (2.44) then so does the projector P_F (of course, one has to check it with the matrix $\Gamma^\mu N_\mu$).

Thus, we have shown that

Theorem 7 *The boundary-value problem for the Rarita–Schwinger system with the boundary conditions (6.31)–(6.33) is gauge-invariant and strongly elliptic provided that the projector P_L satisfies the condition (2.44). Particular examples of such projectors are given by (2.54)–(2.56).*

7 Euclidean quantum gravity

Generalized boundary conditions similar to the ones studied so far occur naturally in Euclidean quantum gravity [4, 5]. The vector bundle G is now the bundle of cotangent vectors, $G = T^*M$, and V is the vector bundle of symmetric rank-2 tensors (also called symmetric 2-forms) over M: $V = T^*M \vee T^*M$, $\vee$ being the symmetrized tensor product. The metric on the bundle G is, naturally, just the metric on M, and the fibre metric E on the bundle V is defined by the equation

$$E^{ab\ cd} \equiv g^{a(c} g^{d)b} + \alpha g^{ab} g^{cd}, \tag{7.1}$$

where α is a real parameter. One has also, for the inverse metric,

$$E^{-1}{}_{ab\ cd} \equiv g_{a(c} g_{d)b} - \frac{\alpha}{(1+\alpha m)} g_{ab} g_{cd}. \tag{7.2}$$

We do not fix the α parameter from the beginning, but rather are going to study the dependence of the heat kernel on it. It is not difficult to show that the eigenvalues of the matrix E are 1 (with degeneracy $m(m+1)/2 - 1$) and $(1 + \alpha m)$. Therefore, this metric is positive-definite only for

$$\alpha > -\frac{1}{m}, \tag{7.3}$$

and becomes singular for $\alpha = -1/m$. Thus, hereafter $\alpha \neq -1/m$.

The generator R of infinitesimal gauge transformations is now defined to be the Lie derivative of the tensor field φ along the vector field ϵ,

$$(R\epsilon)_{ab} \equiv (L_\epsilon \varphi)_{ab} = \sqrt{2}\nabla_{(a}\epsilon_{b)}. \tag{7.4}$$

The adjoint generator $\bar{R}$ with the metric E is defined by its action,

$$(\bar{R}\varphi)_a \equiv -\sqrt{2}E_a{}^{b\,cd}\nabla_b \varphi_{cd}. \tag{7.5}$$

The leading symbol of the ghost operator $L = \bar{R}R$ takes now the form

$$\sigma_L(L;\xi)\epsilon_a = 2E_a{}^{bcd}\xi_b\xi_c\epsilon_d = \left[\delta_a^b|\xi|^2 + (1+2\alpha)\xi_a\xi^b\right]\epsilon_b. \tag{7.6}$$

Therefore, we see that it becomes of Laplace type only for $\alpha = -1/2$. Note also that the operator L has positive-definite leading symbol only for $\alpha > -1$, and becomes degenerate for $\alpha = -1$. Further, the leading symbol of the operator $H = R\bar{R}$ reads

$$\sigma_L(H;\xi)\varphi_{ab} = 2\xi_{(a}E_{b)}{}^{cde}\xi_c\varphi_{de} = \left[2\xi_{(a}\delta_{b)}^{(c}\xi^{d)} + 2\alpha\xi_a\xi_b g^{cd}\right]\varphi_{cd}. \tag{7.7}$$

The gauge-invariant operator Δ is well known (see, e.g. [22, 23]). It has the following leading symbol:

$$\sigma_L(\Delta;\xi)\varphi_{ab} = \left\{\delta_{(a}^{(c}\delta_{b)}^{d)}|\xi|^2 + \xi_a\xi_b g^{cd} - 2\xi_{(a}\delta_{b)}^{(c}\xi^{d)} + \frac{1+2\alpha}{(1+\alpha m)}g_{ab}(\xi^c\xi^d - g^{cd})\right\}\varphi_{cd}. \tag{7.8}$$

Thus, we see that the operator $F = \Delta + H$ is of Laplace type only in the case $\alpha = -1/2$. Let us, however, consider for the time being a Laplace-type operator F on symmetric rank-2 tensors with a fibre metric (7.1) with an *arbitrary* parameter α.

Further, we define the projector Π

$$\Pi = \Pi_{ab}{}^{cd} \equiv q_{(a}{}^c\, q_{b)}{}^d - \frac{\alpha}{(\alpha+1)}N_aN_bq^{cd}, \tag{7.9}$$

where $q_{ab} \equiv g_{ab} - N_aN_b$. It is not difficult to check that it is self-adjoint with respect to the metric E, i.e. $\bar{\Pi} = \Pi$, and that

$$\mathrm{tr}_V\Pi = \frac{1}{2}m(m-1). \tag{7.10}$$

Thus, we consider a Laplace-type operator F acting on symmetric rank-2 tensors with the following boundary conditions:

$$\Pi_{ab}{}^{cd}\varphi_{cd}\Big|_{\partial M} = 0, \tag{7.11}$$

$$E^{ab\,cd}\nabla_b\varphi_{cd}\Big|_{\partial M} = 0. \tag{7.12}$$

Separating the normal derivative we find from here the boundary operator B_F of the form (2.25), the operator Λ being given by (2.57) with the matrices Γ^i defined by

$$\Gamma^i = \Gamma^i{}_{ab}{}^{cd} \equiv -\frac{1}{(1+\alpha)} N_a N_b e^{i(c} N^{d)} + N_{(a} e^i_{b)} N^c N^d. \qquad (7.13)$$

It is not difficult to check that these matrices are anti-self-adjoint and satisfy the conditions (2.58) and (2.59). The matrix $T \equiv \Gamma \cdot \zeta$ reads (cf. [9])

$$T = -\frac{1}{(1+\alpha)} p_1 + p_2, \qquad (7.14)$$

where

$$p_1 = p_{1ab}{}^{cd} \equiv N_a N_b \zeta^{(c} N^{d)}, \qquad p_2 = p_{2ab}{}^{cd} \equiv N_{(a} \zeta_{b)} N^c N^d, \qquad (7.15)$$

and $\zeta_a = e^i_a \zeta_i$, so that $\zeta_a N^a = 0$. It is important to note that

$$\Pi T = T \Pi = 0. \qquad (7.16)$$

We also define further projectors,

$$\rho = \rho_{ab}{}^{cd} \equiv \frac{2}{|\zeta|^2} N_{(a} \zeta_{b)} N^{(c} \zeta^{d)}, \qquad (7.17)$$

$$p = p_{ab}{}^{cd} \equiv N_a N_b N^c N^d, \qquad (7.18)$$

which are mutually orthogonal:

$$p\rho = \rho p = 0. \qquad (7.19)$$

The matrices p_1 and p_2, however, are nilpotent: $p_1^2 = p_2^2 = 0$, and their products are proportional to the projectors:

$$p_1 p_2 = \frac{1}{2} |\zeta|^2 p, \qquad p_2 p_1 = \frac{1}{2} |\zeta|^2 \rho. \qquad (7.20)$$

Therefore, we have

$$T^2 = -\frac{1}{2(1+\alpha)} |\zeta|^2 (p + \rho) \equiv -\tau^2 (p + \rho), \qquad (7.21)$$

where

$$\tau \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{2(1+\alpha)}} |\zeta|. \qquad (7.22)$$

We compute further

$$T^{2n} = (i\tau)^{2n} (p + \rho), \qquad (7.23)$$

$$T^{2n+1} = (i\tau)^{2n} T. \qquad (7.24)$$

Last, by using

$$\mathrm{tr}\, p = \mathrm{tr}\, \rho = 1, \qquad (7.25)$$

$$\mathrm{tr}\, p_1 = \mathrm{tr}\, p_2 = 0, \qquad (7.26)$$

we obtain

$$\mathrm{tr}\, T^{2n} = 2(i\tau)^{2n}, \qquad \mathrm{tr}\, T^{2n+1} = \mathrm{tr}\, T = 0. \qquad (7.27)$$

This suffices to prove:

Lemma 1 *For any function f analytic in the region $|z| \le \tau$, one has*

$$\begin{aligned} f(T) &= f(0)\,[I - p - \rho] + \frac{1}{2}[f(i\tau) + f(-i\tau)](p + \rho) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2i\zeta}[f(i\tau) - f(-i\tau)]T, \end{aligned} \tag{7.28}$$

$$\operatorname{tr} f(T) = \left[\frac{m(m+1)}{2} - 2\right] f(0) + f(i\tau) + f(-i\tau). \tag{7.29}$$

Thus, the eigenvalues of the matrix T are

$$\operatorname{spec}(T) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{with degeneracy} \quad \left[\frac{m(m+1)}{2} - 2\right] \\ i\tau & \text{with degeneracy} \quad 1 \\ -i\tau & \text{with degeneracy} \quad 1 \end{cases} \tag{7.30}$$

with τ defined by eq. (7.22).

This means that the eigenvalues of the matrix T^2 for a non-vanishing ζ_j are 0 and $-1/[2(1+\alpha)]|\zeta|^2$. Thus, the strong ellipticity condition (2.81), which means that the matrix $(T^2 + \zeta^2 I)$, for non-zero ζ, should be positive-definite, takes the form

$$-\frac{1}{2(1+\alpha)} + 1 > 0. \tag{7.31}$$

This proves eventually

Theorem 8 *The boundary-value problem for a Laplace-type operator acting on sections of the bundle of symmetric rank-2 tensors with the boundary conditions (7.11) and (7.12) is strongly elliptic with respect to $\mathbf{C} - \mathbf{R}_+$ only for*

$$\alpha > -\frac{1}{2}. \tag{7.32}$$

Remarks. First, let us note that the condition (7.32) of strong ellipticity is compatible with the condition (7.3) of positivity of the fibre metric E. Second, it is exactly the value $\alpha = -1/2$ that appears in the gauge-invariant boundary conditions in one-loop quantum gravity in the minimal DeWitt gauge. For a general value $\alpha \ne -1/2$, the operator F resulting from Δ and H is *not* of Laplace type, which complicates the analysis significantly. In other words, we have a corollary [9]:

Corollary 3 *The boundary-value problem in one-loop Euclidean quantum gravity, with a Laplace-type operator F acting on rank-two symmetric tensor fields, and with the gauge-invariant boundary conditions (7.11) and (7.12), the fibre metric being E with $\alpha = -1/2$, is not strongly elliptic with respect to $\mathbf{C} - \mathbf{R}_+$.*

We can also evaluate the coefficient $a_{1/2}$ of heat-kernel asymptotics. This is most easily obtained by using the representation (3.94) of the coefficient $\beta_{1/2}$ in form of a Gaussian integral. Using eq. (7.21) we get first

$$\exp(-T^2) - I = \left\{\exp\left[\frac{1}{2(1+\alpha)}|\zeta|^2\right] - I\right\}(p+\rho). \tag{7.33}$$

Therefore, from eq. (3.94) we obtain

$$\beta_{1/2} = 2\int\limits_{\mathbf{R}^{m-1}} \frac{d\zeta}{\pi^{(m-1)/2}}\left\{\exp\left[-\frac{1+2\alpha}{2(1+\alpha)}|\zeta|^2\right] - e^{-|\zeta|^2}\right\}(p+\rho). \tag{7.34}$$

One should bear in mind that ρ is a projector that depends on ζ (see (7.17)). Although ρ is singular at the point $\zeta = 0$, the integral is well defined because of the difference of two exponential functions. Calculating the Gaussian integrals we obtain

$$\beta_{1/2} = 2\left[\left(\frac{2(\alpha+1)}{1+2\alpha}\right)^{(m-1)/2} - 1\right]\left(p + \frac{1}{(m-1)}\psi\right), \tag{7.35}$$

$$a_{1/2} = \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2}\left\{I - 2\Pi + 2\left[\left(\frac{2(\alpha+1)}{1+2\alpha}\right)^{(m-1)/2} - 1\right]\left(p + \frac{1}{(m-1)}\psi\right)\right\}, \tag{7.36}$$

where ψ is yet another projector:

$$\psi = \psi_{ab}{}^{cd} \equiv 2N_{(a}q_{b)}^{\;\;(c}N^{d)}. \tag{7.37}$$

Last, from eq. (3.92), by using the traces of the projectors (7.10), (7.25) and (7.37), and the dimension of the bundle of symmetric rank-2 tensors,

$$\dim V = \mathrm{tr}_V I = \frac{1}{2}m(m+1), \tag{7.38}$$

we obtain

$$\mathrm{tr}_V a_{1/2} = \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2}\left\{-\frac{1}{2}m(m-3) - 4 + 4\left[\frac{2(\alpha+1)}{1+2\alpha}\right]^{(m-1)/2}\right\}. \tag{7.39}$$

Thus, we see that there is a singularity at $\alpha = -1/2$, which reflects the lack of strong ellipticity in this case.

7.1 Heat-kernel diagonal in the non-elliptic case

Consider now the case $\alpha = -1/2$. From eq. (7.28) we have, in particular,

$$\begin{aligned}(I\,\mu - iT)^{-1} &= \frac{1}{\mu}(I - p - \rho) + \frac{\mu}{\mu^2 - |\zeta|^2}(p+\rho) + i\frac{1}{\mu^2 - |\zeta|^2}T \\ &= \frac{1}{\mu}(I - p - \rho) - \frac{\mu}{\lambda}(p+\rho) - i\frac{1}{\lambda}T,\end{aligned} \tag{7.40}$$

$$\det\,(I\,\mu - iT) = \mu^{m(m+1)/2-2}(\mu^2 - |\zeta|^2) = (|\zeta|^2 - \lambda)^{m(m+1)/4-1}(-\lambda). \tag{7.41}$$

For the boundary-value problem to be strongly elliptic, this determinant should be non-vanishing for any $(\zeta,\lambda) \neq (0,0)$ and $\lambda \in \mathbf{C} - \mathbf{R}_+$, including the case $\lambda = 0$, $\zeta \neq 0$. Actually we see that, for any non-zero $\lambda \notin \mathbf{R}_+$, this determinant does not vanish for any ζ. However, for $\lambda = 0$ and any ζ it equals zero, which means that the corresponding boundary conditions *do not* fix a unique solution of the eigenvalue equation for the leading symbol, subject to a decay condition at infinity. This is reflected by the simple fact that the coefficient $a_{1/2}$ of the asymptotic expansion of the heat kernel is not well defined, in that the integrals that determine it are divergent. At the technical level, the non-ellipticity is reflected in the fact that the heat-kernel diagonal, although well defined, has a *non-standard non-integrable* behaviour near the boundary, i.e. for $r \to 0$.

To prove this property, let us calculate the fibre trace of the heat-kernel diagonal. From (3.81) we have

$$\mathrm{tr}_V U_0(t|x,x) = (4\pi t)^{-m/2}\left[c_0 + c_1 e^{-r^2/t} + J(r/\sqrt{t})\right], \tag{7.42}$$

where

$$c_0 \equiv \dim V = \frac{m(m+1)}{2}, \tag{7.43}$$

$$c_1 \equiv \mathrm{tr}_V(I - 2\Pi) = -\frac{m(m-3)}{2}, \tag{7.44}$$

$$J(z) \equiv \mathrm{tr}_V\Phi(z) = -2\int\limits_{\mathbf{R}^{m-1}} \frac{d\zeta}{\pi^{(m-1)/2}} \int\limits_C \frac{d\omega}{\sqrt{\pi}}\, e^{-|\zeta|^2-\omega^2+2i\omega z}\, \mathrm{tr}_V\Gamma\cdot\zeta(\omega\,I + \Gamma\cdot\zeta)^{-1}. \tag{7.45}$$

Now, for $\alpha = -1/2$ the parameter τ (7.22) determining the eigenvalues of the matrix $T = \Gamma\cdot\zeta$ is equal to $\tau = |\zeta|$. By using (7.29) we get

$$J(z) = -4\int\limits_{\mathbf{R}^{m-1}} \frac{d\zeta}{\pi^{(m-1)/2}} \int\limits_C \frac{d\omega}{\sqrt{\pi}}\, e^{-|\zeta|^2-\omega^2+2i\omega z}\, \frac{|\zeta|^2}{\omega^2 + |\zeta|^2} \tag{7.46}$$

Remember that the contour C lies in the upper half plane: it comes from $-\infty + i\varepsilon$, encircles the point $\omega = i|\zeta|$ in the clockwise direction and goes to $\infty + i\varepsilon$. The integral over ω is calculated by using the formula

$$\int\limits_C d\omega\, f(\omega) = -2\pi i\, \mathrm{Res}_{\omega=i|\zeta|}\, f(\omega) + \int\limits_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\omega\, f(\omega). \tag{7.47}$$

The integrals over ζ can be reduced to Gaussian integrals by lifting the denominator in the exponent (cf. (3.83)) or by using spherical coordinates. In this way we get eventually

$$J(z) = 2(m-1)\Gamma(m/2)\,\frac{1}{z^m} - 2(m-1)\int\limits_0^1 du\, u^{m/2-1} e^{-z^2 u}. \tag{7.48}$$

This can also be written in the form

$$J(z) = 2(m-1)z^{-m}\left[\Gamma(m/2) - \gamma(m/2, z^2)\right] = 2(m-1)z^{-m}\Gamma(m/2, z^2), \tag{7.49}$$

by using the incomplete γ-functions

$$\gamma(a,x) \equiv \int_0^x du\, u^{a-1} e^{-u}, \qquad \Gamma(a,x) \equiv \int_x^\infty du\, u^{a-1} e^{-u}. \tag{7.50}$$

It is immediately seen that the function $J(z)$ is singular as $z \to 0$

$$J(z) \sim 2(m-1)\Gamma(m/2)\,\frac{1}{z^m}. \tag{7.51}$$

By using the identity

$$\Gamma(a,x) = x^{a-1}e^{-x} + (a-1)\Gamma(a-1,x) \tag{7.52}$$

we also find that, when $z \to \infty$, $J(z)$ is exponentially small, i.e.

$$J(z) \sim 2(m-1)z^{-2}e^{-z^2}. \tag{7.53}$$

Note that, for $\alpha = -\frac{1}{2}$, one has $\mathrm{tr}_V T^2 = -2|\zeta|^2$, and hence $\mathrm{tr}_V \Gamma^i\Gamma^j = -2g^{ij}$ and $\mathrm{tr}_V \Gamma^2 = -2(m-1)$. Thus, we see that the asymptotics (7.53) as $z \to \infty$ corresponds to eq. (3.88).

The singularity at the point $z = 0$ results exactly from the pole at $\omega = i|\zeta|$. In the strongly elliptic case all poles lie on the positive imaginary line with $\mathrm{Im}\,\omega < i|\zeta|$, so that there is a *finite* gap between the pole located at the point with the largest value of the imaginary part and the point $i|\zeta|$.

Thus, we obtain

$$\mathrm{tr}_V U_0(t|x,x) = (4\pi t)^{-m/2}\left[c_0 + c_1 e^{-r^2/t} + 2(m-1)\left(\frac{r}{\sqrt{t}}\right)^{-m}\Gamma(m/2, r^2/t)\right]. \tag{7.54}$$

Here the first term is the standard first term in the heat-kernel asymptotics which gives the familiar interior contribution when integrated over a compact manifold. The boundary terms in (7.54) are exponentially small as $t \to 0^+$, if r is kept fixed. Actually, these terms should behave, as $t \to 0^+$, as distributions near the boundary, so that they give well defined non-vanishing contributions (in form of integrals over the boundary) when integrated with a smooth function. The third term, however, gives rise to an unusual singularity at the boundary as $r \to 0$ (on fixing t):

$$\mathrm{tr}_V U_0(t|x,x) \overset{r\to 0}{\sim} (4\pi)^{-m/2} 2(m-1)\Gamma(m/2)\frac{1}{r^m}. \tag{7.55}$$

This limit is *non-standard* in that: i) it does not depend on t and ii) it is *not integrable* over r near the boundary, as $r \to 0$. This is a direct consequence of the lack of strong ellipticity.

8 Concluding remarks

We have studied a generalized boundary-value problem for operators of Laplace type, where a part of the field is subject to Dirichlet boundary conditions, and the remaining part is subject to conditions which generalize the Robin case by the inclusion of tangential derivatives. The corresponding boundary operator can be always expressed in the form (2.25), where Λ is a tangential differential operator of the form (2.57). The fermionic analysis for Dirac-type operators has also been developed. The strong ellipticity of the resulting boundary-value problem is crucial, in particular, to ensure the existence of the asymptotic expansions frequently studied in the theory of heat kernels [1]. In physical problems, this means that the one-loop semi-classical expansions of the Green functions and of the effective action in quantum field theory are well defined and can be computed explicitly on compact Riemannian manifolds with smooth boundary. The occurrence of boundaries plays indeed a key role in the path-integral approach to quantum gravity [24], and it appears desirable to study the strong ellipticity problem for all gauge theories of physical interest, now that a unified scheme for the derivation of BRST-invariant boundary conditions is available [6].

We have thus tried to understand whether the following requirements are compatible:

(i) The gauge-field operator, F, should be of Laplace type (and the same for the ghost operator);

(ii) Local nature of the boundary operator B_F (in fact, we have studied the case when B_F is a first-order differential operator, and boundary projectors for fermionic fields);

(iii) Gauge invariance of the boundary conditions;

(iv) Strong ellipticity of the boundary-value problem (F, B_F).

First, we have found a condition of strong ellipticity (see (2.80)) for a generalized boundary-value problem for a Laplace-type operator. For operators of Dirac type, one finds instead the strong ellipticity properties described in our Theorem 4. Second, we have constructed the resolvent kernel and the heat kernel in the leading approximation (sect. 3.1 and sect. 3.2) and evaluated the first non-trivial heat-kernel coefficient $A_{1/2}$ in Eqs. (3.96) and (3.99). Third, we have found a criterion of strong ellipticity of a general gauge theory in terms of the gauge generators (see (4.61)). As physical applications of the above results we have studied the Yang–Mills, Rarita–Schwinger and Einstein field theories. Interestingly, only in the latter the strong ellipticity condition is not satisfied if the conditions (i), (ii) and (iii) hold. Moreover, the gauge-invariant boundary conditions for the Rarita–Schwinger system have been found to involve only the boundary projector for the ghost operator. As far as we know, our results as well as the consequent analysis of the physical gauge models, are completely original, or extend significantly previous work in the literature [3, 9, 11].

Since we find that, for gravitation, the four conditions listed above are not, in general, compatible, it seems that one should investigate in detail at least one of the following alternatives:

(1) Quantum gravity and quantum supergravity on manifolds with boundary with gauge-field operators which are non-minimal;

(2) Non-local boundary conditions for gravitation [25] and spin-3/2 fields [26];

(3) Non-gauge-invariant 'regularization' of the boundary conditions, which suppresses the tangential derivatives and improves the ellipticity;

(4) Boundary conditions which are not completely gauge-invariant, and hence avoid the occurrence of tangential derivatives in the boundary operator.

The latter possibility has been investigated in [27] and has been widely used in the physical literature (see [28] and references therein). The first 3 options are not yet (completely) exploited in the literature. In particular, it is unclear whether one has to resort to non-minimal operators to preserve strong ellipticity of the boundary-value problem. Moreover, non-local boundary conditions which are completely gauge-invariant, compatible with local supersymmetry transformations at the boundary (cf. [27]), and ensure strong ellipticity, are not easily obtained (if at all admissible). Indeed, it should not be especially surprising that gauge theories have, in general, an *essentially non-local* character. Since the projectors on the physical gauge-invariant subspace of the configuration space are non-local, a consistent formulation of gauge theories on Riemannian manifolds (even without boundary) is *necessarily* non-local (see [23]).

Thus, there is increasing evidence in favor of boundaries raising deep and unavoidable foundational issues for the understanding of modern quantum field theories [29]. The solution of such problems might in turn shed new light on spectral geometry and on the general theory of elliptic operators [1, 30].

Acknowledgements

We are much indebted to Andrei Barvinsky, Thomas Branson, Stuart Dowker, Peter Gilkey, Alexander Kamenshchik, Klaus Kirsten and Hugh Osborn for correspondence and discussion of the generalized boundary conditions, and to Stephen Fulling for valuable remarks. The work of IA was supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft.

References

[1] Gilkey, P.B.: *Invariance Theory, the Heat Equation and the Atiyah-Singer Index Theorem.* Boca Raton, FL: Chemical Rubber Company, 1995

[2] Branson, T.P., Gilkey, P.B., Ørsted, B.: Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **109**, 437 (1990)

[3] McAvity, D.M., Osborn, H.: Class. Quantum Grav. **8**, 1445 (1991)

[4] Barvinsky, A. O.: Phys. Lett. **B195**, 344 (1987)

[5] Avramidi, I.G., Esposito, G., Kamenshchik, A.Yu.: Class. Quantum Grav. **13**, 2361 (1996)

[6] Moss, I.G., Silva, P.J.: Phys. Rev. **D55**, 1072 (1997)

[7] Berline, N., Getzler, E., Vergne, M.: *Heat Kernels and Dirac Operators*. Berlin: Springer, 1992

[8] Reed, M., Simon, B.: *Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics, II: Fourier Analysis and Self-Adjointness*. New York: Academic, 1975

[9] Avramidi, I.G., Esposito, G.: Class. Quantum Grav. **15**, 1141 (1998)

[10] Gilkey, P.B., Smith, L.: J. Diff. Geom. **18**, 393 (1983)

[11] Dowker, J.S., Kirsten, K.: Class. Quantum Grav. **14**, L169 (1997)

[12] Avramidi, I.G., Esposito, G.: Class. Quantum Grav. **15**, 281 (1998)

[13] Avramidi, I. G.: Nucl. Phys. **B355**, 712 (1991)

[14] Kirsten, K: Class. Quantum Grav. **15**, L5 (1998)

[15] Seeley, R.T.: *Topics in Pseudo-Differential Operators*. In *C.I.M.E., Conference on Pseudo-Differential Operators*, Roma, Edizioni Cremonese, 169 (1969)

[16] Seeley, R.T.: Am. J. Math. **91**, 889 (1969)

[17] Gilkey, P.B., Smith, L.: Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **36**, 85 (1983)

[18] Hörmander, L.: *The Analysis of Linear Partial Differential Operators III, Grundlehren d. Mathem.* **274**. Berlin: Springer-Verlag, 1985

[19] Booss-Bavnbek, B., Wojciechowski, K.P.: *Elliptic Boundary Problems for Dirac Operators*. Boston: Birkhäuser, 1993

[20] Avramidi, I. G.: *Green functions of higher-order differential operators*, Preprint hep-th/9707040; J. Math. Phys. (1998), to appear

[21] Avramidi, I.G.: Yad. Fiz., **56**, 245 (1993); Transl. in: Phys. Atom. Nucl. **56**, 138 (1993)

[22] DeWitt, B.S.: *The Space-Time Approach to Quantum Field Theory*. In *Relativity, Groups and Topology II*, eds. B.S. DeWitt, R. Stora, Amsterdam, North-Holland, 381 (1984)

[23] Avramidi, I.G.: Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A6**, 1693 (1991)

[24] Hawking, S.W.: *The Path-Integral Approach to Quantum Gravity*. In *General Relativity, an Einstein Centenary Survey*, eds. S.W. Hawking and W. Israel, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 746 (1979)

[25] Marachevsky, V.N., Vassilevich, D.V.: Class. Quantum Grav. **13**, 645 (1996)

[26] D'Eath, P.D., Esposito, G.: Phys. Rev. **D44**, 1713 (1991)

[27] Luckock, H.C.: J. Math. Phys. **32**, 1755 (1991)

[28] Esposito, G., Kamenshchik, A.Yu., Pollifrone, G.: *Euclidean Quantum Gravity on Manifolds with Boundary*, *Fundamental Theories of Physics* **85**. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1997

[29] Vassilevich, D.V.: *The Faddeev-Popov trick in the presence of boundaries*. Preprint hep-th/9709182

[30] Esposito, G.: *Dirac Operators and Spectral Geometry*, *Cambridge Lecture Notes in Physics* **12**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998